

THE *11- Feb*
SATISFACTION
OF
CHRIST
DEMONSTRATED.

IN
A SERIES of DIALOGUES.

By JOHN BEATSON. *K*

12 Feb
The Son of man came—to give his life a
RANSOM *for many.* JESUS.

Who gave himself a RANSOM for all. PAUL.

L E E D S :

Printed for the AUTHOR;

And sold by J. Rivington, in St. Paul's Church-Yard,
and Messrs. Richardson and Urquhart, under the
Royal-Exchange, London.

19



THE PREFACE.

IT is not many months ago, since a pamphlet appeared in the world, entitled, *The Divine Character of Christ considered and vindicated*, which has met with a favourable reception from the public. The author of that small performance had designed the following pages, on the Satisfaction of the Redeemer, to have appeared along with it. But thinking that if the work were divided, which he apprehended it might be without the least disadvantage to it, the purchase of it would be easier to the lower class of people; he therefore determined to make a partition of it, and as the latter in his opinion is entirely dependent upon the former, he thought it by far the most eligible that *that* should precede and *this* follow.

The subject of the following pages, as well as that of the preceding part, it must be confessed is of great importance, and universal concern. It constitutes the vitals of real Christianity. It is as it were the life-blood of the gospel, collected at the heart; whence it circulates with health and vigour, through every artery of the Christian constitution.—Take either the Divinity, or Satisfaction of Christ away, and you leave an unanimated carcase; decorated it may be with the trappings of some useless forms, but like the church of Sardis, having only a name of *living*, and yet being in reality, *dead*. And if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?

Conscious of the interesting nature of the subjects, and knowing the repeated and virulent opposition that has lately been made to them, the author is desirous to bear a testimony in their favour. He does not “intrench himself behind the authority of *great numbers*, or *great names*,” as “the abettors of satisfaction” are said “generally” to do. He knows very well, that it is “no matter how many churches, or how many men concur in the support of
of

THE PREFACE.

v

of a doctrine, if it be not at the same time agreeable to the religion of Jesus." And "*their* authority," he is free to acknowledge, "is *no* authority in matters of this nature; else we call ourselves PROTESTANTS with very little propriety."

The Bible, the Bible alone, contains the religion of Christians. This is a first-principle with the author, and, in his apprehension, the very basis of genuine Protestantism. If this once be given up, we immediately revert back again to the absurd, pernicious, soul-destroying doctrine, of the absolute infallibility of the Catholic-Church.

The author in discussing the doctrine of Satisfaction, as well as that of the Deity of Christ, has retained the Dialogue form, and that for reasons already assigned*. He has likewise continued the same Dialogists, as in the former part, and even regularly numbered the dialogues too, as he thought it very probable that few would be the purchasers of *this*, but those who had had the reading of *that*.

The objections noticed in the following work, are taken from some modern authors,

a 3

thors,

* See the preface to the former part.

thors, whose writings have made much noise in the religious world, and who have attacked the doctrines of the gospel in general, and this that is the subject of the following pages in particular, in the most intrepid and furious manner.—They have boldly attempted to raze it, even to the foundation, but their utmost efforts have hitherto proved absolutely abortive, and must certainly ever be so, till the salutary light of scripture be totally extinguished. It is so interwoven in that admirable texture, that it is impossible for the most acute genius to extract it, without entirely disfiguring the whole.

Indeed our warmest opponents in fact acknowledge this. For, they affirm, that “to those who lived in the times in which the scriptures were published, they were, no doubt, very intelligible; the language in which they are written, and the customs to which they allude, being perfectly known to them. But” they add, “what was easy to them, a long course of time has rendered extremely difficult to us, who use a very different language, and whose manners and customs are so exceedingly unlike those of the Jews.”

What

THE PREFACE. vii

What is this but to throw dust in the eyes of the people ; to degrade the bible almost to nothing ; and, after all, to acknowledge that, according to our translation of the scriptures, our doctrine is confirmed by invincible evidence.—Supposing we are unacquainted with the language in which the scriptures were written ; What then ? Cannot we understand them in our own language ? If we cannot, how pitiable is the condition of the generality of people in this nation ! They are under the most indispensable obligations to receive the truth, and yet are totally at a loss where to find it ! A deplorable state indeed, if the premises were true ! But to shew that our translation is sufficiently perfect, let us hear one, who all must allow was thoroughly capable of judging in this case, declare his opinion concerning it*.

‘ Let not any, says this zealous and able defender of gospel truth, be uneasy in their minds about translations, because they are not upon an equality with the original text, and especially about our own ;
for

* The late Rev. JOHN GILL, D. D.

for as it has been the will of God that the Bible should be translated into different languages, he has taken care, in his providence, to raise up men capable of such a performance, in various nations, particularly in our own : For, whenever a set of men have been engaged in this work, as were in our nation, men well skilled in the languages, and partakers of the grace of God ; of sound principles, and of integrity and faithfulness, having the fear of God before their eyes ; they have never failed of producing a translation worthy of acceptance ; and in which, though they have erred in some LESS and LIGHTER matters, yet not so as to affect ANY momentous article of faith or practice*.

This position, the author presumes, will be granted by every learned and ingenuous person. Indeed, if this were not the case, any APPEAL to the professors of Christianity, the major part of whom, it must be confessed, are of the lower class of people, would be absolutely in vain, if not highly ridiculous.

Conscious,

* GILL's Body of Divinity, vol. 1. page 45.

THE PREFACE. ix

Conscious, as it should seem, of the shameful and repeated defeats they have received, the opposers of the truth, dreading the formidable sword of the Spirit, are obliged continually to change their ground, and to use all the art and chicanery they are capable of. They no longer dare to appear in the open field, but, like a vanquished army, retreat by trackless paths, and hide themselves in morasses which they think inaccessible.

The author of the following pages does not think that our translation in the least favours the cause he is defending more than the original text; but he chuses to appeal to the scriptures as we have them in our own language, purely that the tract may be of more general use, and that the common people, whose interest he has chiefly in view, may be capable of forming a judgement of the important things of which he writes.

In fine; the author would recommend what he has now written to the most serious and candid consideration of every reader; “desiring he would peruse it with his Bible at hand, turning to every passage to which he is referred, and reading

x THE PREFACE.

ing what goes before and after it; and the author has not the least doubt but that, in this manner, the reader will see much more reason to reject the interpretation which his adversaries has given to those passages, than he has suggested in this treatise, in which he has made a point of being as concise as he possibly could, consistently with perspicuity," And the rather would he desire this of the reader, since the multiplicity of the texts he has produced, and which evidently relate to the subject, would not admit him to be large in the illustration of them, except he had greatly exceeded his intended limits.

Indeed many of the passages quoted in the following dialogues have no need of an illustration. Every man's conscience must immediately feel the force of them. They are no less plain than the sun when he has reached the meridian. All attempts to explain them, in the author's opinion, is *darkening counsel by words without knowledge*. Whether he is right in this, and whether the plan he has pursued in the following little tract be an eligible one, the public must now judge, and

THE PREFACE. xi

and to their calm, dispassionate, unbiaſſed judgement he now appeals.

That a Divine bleſſing may attend the peruſal of the following pages, and that they may in ſome meaſure contribute to promote the Redeemer's glory, is the ſincere deſire of the reader's well-wiſher and ſervant for Jeſus's ſake.

THE AUTHOR.

HULL, *April*, 1774.

2

fr
fu

fr
lar
Fr
wo
wa

—
—
crij
ally

stru
thein
who
ly ob

S
dicti
Isaia

T
tisfac
same

THE CONTENTS.

D I A L. X.

THE subject introduced: The notion of Christ's Satisfaction stated: Its absolute Necessity shewn; from the nature of the law: Repentance entirely insufficient to satisfy the law: Reflection upon this.

D I A L. XI.

The necessity of Satisfaction further evinced;—from the nature of the Divine Perfections, particularly the Justice—Holiness—and Veracity of God: From the design of our Saviour's coming into the world, and the means by which that important end was attained.

D I A L. XII.

The reality of Christ's Satisfaction demonstrated;—from the first declaration of grace to guilty man;—the nature and design of sacrificing: Jewish sacrifices, both eucharistic and propitiatory, intentionally figurative of the Lord Jesus Christ.

D I A L. XIII.

The subject of Sacrifices continued: What instructions the Offerers had relative to the pardon of their moral guilt: Evidence that those Offerers, who eyed Christ as the end of their Sacrifices, really obtained such a pardon.

D I A L. XIV.

Satisfaction further evinced from the various predictions of the Prophets, particularly those of David, Isaiah, and Daniel.

D I A L. XV.

The testimony of John the Baptist respecting Satisfaction: Christ's own testimony relative to the same subject;—especially his representing his death
as

ii THE CONTENTS.

as a Ransom for sinners—his affirmation to the disciples at the administration of the Supper—and his behaviour and expressions in the garden of Gethsemane.

D I A L. XVI.

Apostolic representations of the nature of Christ's death : Particularly as—a sacrifice for sin : This idea of it confirmed from our Lord's sustaining the character of a Priest :—As an atonement.

D I A L. XVII.

As making reconciliation for sinners : As a propitiation for sin : The scripture idea of the term Surety as applied to Christ expressive of Satisfaction.

D I A L. XVIII.

Satisfaction further demonstrated from—our Lord's office as Mediator of the new covenant ;—the imputation of sin to him ;—his being made a curse for us ;—and paying a price for our ransom.

D I A L. XIX.

Blessings procured by the Lord Jesus Christ :—As pardon—justification—peace—adoption, &c. The salutary tendency of the doctrine insisted on.

D I A L. XX.

The salutary tendency of Satisfaction further considered, and its happy effects shewn ;—from that sense of obligation that all are possessed of, who cordially believe the gospel of Christ ;—a new nature being imparted to them ;—that discovery of the intrinsic evil of sin they are favoured with ;—their views of the moral Perfections of God ;—and that love and gratitude which it is so directly calculated to inspire in the heart. The professors of it vindicated from some false and malicious slanders.

DIA-

DIALOGUE X.

NEOPHYTUS. **A**S we have, at some preceding opportunities, discussed the important subject of the Divinity of Christ; I could wish, if it be agreeable to you, that we might now proceed to consider his *satisfaction*, or *atonement*.

PHILANTHROPOS. With all my heart: If I can communicate any thing which may be in the least serviceable to you upon the subject, I am extremely willing to do it.

NEO. I have thought, that in consequence of Christ's appearing in our nature, and suffering in the sinner's stead, a full and satisfactory price was given to the law and justice of God for sin, and that this was to be considered as the procuring cause of our pardon, justification, adoption, and, in short, of all the invaluable blessings of the grace of God.

PHIL. Well, and do you think differently now?

VOL. II.

A

NEO.

NEO. No ; I still believe with respect to this exactly as I did. But I find many others entertain very opposite sentiments from me upon the subject ; affirming, that “ to consider the obedience and sufferings of Christ as a complete satisfaction to the justice of God for the sins of men, is an *irrational* and *absurd* doctrine ; a mere figment of the dark ages, when scholastic and metaphysical jargon triumphed over truth, reason, and common sense.” And that “ allowing its conformity to the sentiments of Protestant creeds, yet it is not by any means conformable either to reason or scripture, but a manifest insult upon both.”

PHIL. Indeed ! Numbers of the wisest and best of men then, for a long succession of ages, have been acting the most irrational and absurd part. This, methinks, is rather too harsh a judgement, unless the evidence of it be exceedingly strong. If, however, the charge you have advanced be well supported ; if it can be shown that the proposition you have mentioned, is contrary “ to scripture and reason ;” then I confess those who have sealed it with their blood have been greatly mistaken, and have died to confirm a palpable falshood.

Should your mind be any way unhinged relative to this, what ideas I have of it, I am extremely willing to impart unto you, if you think it may be attended with any degree of spiritual advantage and improvement.

NEO.

Dial. X. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 3.

NEO. I hope it may be of singular use ; for, though I have not much uneasiness relative to it, yet I could wish to be able always to give an answer to every one that asketh me a reason of the hope that is in me.

Seeing then it is affirmed, that the blood of Christ " could have nothing acceptable or propitiating in it, any more than the blood of sacrificial animals ;" that " there is not a single text in all the New Testament, as far as they can remember, that can, by any rules of just and sober criticism be retained in the support of it ;" and that " no satisfaction besides *penitence* is ever insisted on, or so much as mentioned in the sacred records ;" seeing these assertions are so peremptory, I could wish you would shew me upon what foundation the doctrine is built, and point out the proper evidence of it from the word of God.

PHIL. It is *built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets* ; and therefore, notwithstanding the violent and repeated blasts of error which beat against it, it remains, like a house upon a rock, firm and immoveable. However, as you say it is affirmed, that " there is not a single text in all the New Testament, that can be retained in the support of it," at your request I will, as minutely and impartially as I can, examine that sacred book.

4 ON THE NECESSITY Dial. X.

NEO. I wish you would : I shall take it exceedingly kind, and doubt not but it will be conducive to my spiritual profit.

PHIL. Before we proceed to discuss the subject, it may not be improper to premise, that, The New Testament is to be illustrated by an attention to the Old ; and as “ in order to throw light upon the scriptures, we must attend not to what Heathen poets and historians affix to certain forms and modes of speech, but only to the ideas which the Jews annexed to them ;” so, that this end may be attained, we will consider the two Testaments as inseparably connected, and as containing one glorious and perfect system of evangelical truth.

NEO. The observation appears to be just ; and I am the better pleased with it, seeing that our Lord himself, in his discourses, frequently referred to Moses and the prophets.

PHIL. What is the notion which you have of the term *satisfaction* ?

NEO. Satisfaction, in its common and most usual sense, means, An adequate compensation given by one person to another, who has suffered a real or a supposed injury. Sometimes indeed it is used “ to denote the pleasure which the mind takes in any thing that is the object of our hopes and pursuits ;” but, the former sense is, I think, more agreeable to the general usage of

Dial. X. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 5

of the word. And it is evidently the meaning of it as used by the Jewish legislator: *Ye shall take no SATISFACTION for the life of a murderer who is guilty of death; but he shall surely be put to death.* The plain meaning of which declaration is, Thou shalt take nothing as an *equivalent* for the life of a person who is guilty of murder, but *by man shall his blood be shed.*

PHIL. Very right: "It is what we commonly call a *forensic* term, borrowed from the civil law, and means the reparation of damages or injuries, where such reparation is demanded or deemed necessary." And therefore, when we apply the term to the Lord Jesus Christ, we mean, That glorious and full compensation which he gave for the sins of men, and to procure them a right to glory, by his obedience to the precept of the law, and his suffering the penalty annexed to the violation of it.

NEO. Is the word any where applied to our Saviour, in the New Testament?

PHIL. No; it is not used there in so many syllables, but the idea which we affix to it is, as I hope will be fully proved, clearly exhibited in those sacred pages. And we think it the most proper word of any other, to express our notion of what the Lord Jesus Christ has done and suffered in the room and stead of sinners, in order to redeem them from eternal misery, and save them with an everlasting salvation. Besides, though the word *satisfaction* be not used

in the scriptures in reference unto Christ, yet there are many terms and phrases which are synonymous to it, and expressive of it. And though we ought to entertain the highest esteem for the words of scripture, and have the greatest value for them, as being clothed with such majesty, and having such energy in them, as the words which man's wisdom teacheth have not; yet our sense of them cannot be expressed but in words literally varying from them; so that in the explication of scripture such words and phrases must necessarily be used.

NEO. Allowing *that*; a modern writer says, "Satisfaction, as implying a reparation of injuries, is not, he apprehends, to be found in the New Testament, nor indeed any other word of a similar signification." And "the scripture notion of the term, as applied to Christ, he takes to be, His obedience to God, or the perfect rectitude of his moral character. Any other notion of his satisfaction cannot, he thinks, be cleverly made out."

You will be so kind, therefore, as collect the evidence which the scripture gives, both that such a satisfaction was *necessary*, and that, in fact, it was really made.

PHIL. With the utmost readiness: Only I would premise that, supposing the Lord Jesus Christ to have been "*a mere man*," which is, in the opinion of some, "the scripture idea of him,"

Dial. X. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 7

him," his obedience to God, though ever so perfect, could certainly make no satisfaction at all for the sins of rebellious creatures. No; were he only a *created* being, though of the highest order, he could never have done *that* for apostate man, which in the sacred oracles is peremptorily affirmed of him.

For instance: Could "a *man*, a *mere man*, a man in all respects like ourselves," have made an end of sin, and brought in everlasting righteousness*? Could he, by one offering, have perfected for ever all them that are sanctified†? In a word, Could such a person by himself have purged our sins§, or have obtained eternal redemption for us‡?

NEO. I should think it absolutely impossible.

PHIL. Certainly: For, the law of God demands the most perfect obedience from every rational creature. Every deviation from it, though but in thought||, is sin. Had therefore the adorable Saviour been only a *man*; nay, had he been an angel of the highest order, he could not possibly have done any thing more than what was his indispensable duty to do. So that, upon this supposition, we could derive no more advantage from *his* obedience, than from that of any other pious man, whose example is left upon record in the scriptures. But that is an assertion so directly contrary to the whole current

* Dan. ix. 24. † Heb. x. 14. § Ibid i. 3. ‡ Ibid ix. 12.

|| Prov. xxiv. 9.

§ ON THE NECESSITY Dial. X.

current of revelation, as will, I should think, at once discover its absolute fallacy.

NEO. The idea which you have now expressed, That no created being can do more than what is indispensably required of him, is, I think, exceedingly obvious; and will not surely be questioned by any.—But is not this rather foreign to the subject?

PHIL. I think not: However, we will now attend to it in a more direct and immediate manner.

That the satisfaction of Christ then, in consequence of man's rebellion against his Sovereign, was *necessary*, absolutely necessary, in order to his pardon, justification, and adoption into the family of heaven, will, I think, evidently appear, if we consider the nature of the Divine law, together with the justice, holiness, and veracity of its all-glorious Author.

Besides, what our Lord himself has declared, both with respect to the important end for which he appeared in our world, and the means by which that end was actually attained, will be no inconsiderable addition to the argument.

NEO. You apprehend then that the *law* of God required that such a satisfaction should be given.

PHIL. I do: For, the law of God, which is an eternal rule of righteousness to all intelligent

Dial. X. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 9

gent creatures, has its foundation laid in the perfections of the great Legislator. It is a plain declaration of his most holy will, dictated solely by infinite wisdom, and prescribed as the unalterable rule of our duty. And as God *is the rock, whose work is perfect* *, he cannot possibly be the author either of an imperfect, or an iniquitous law. No; possessed of the most transcendent excellencies and perfections, he must necessarily require the supreme regard of all his intelligent creatures. And as his glory is infinite, and his beauty ineffable, the least defect in our love to him, is a sin which has infinite demerit attending it, and renders the transgressor liable to eternal perdition, which is the equitable sanction annexed to the violation of the law.

NEO. How do you prove that eternal death is the sanction annexed to the breach of the law?

PHIL. From the nature of the object against whom the offence is committed, and from the express declarations of the great Legislator himself. The greatness of an offence, in the estimation of human laws, is much enhanced by the dignity of the person against whom it is committed. To affront or injure an *equal*, is criminal and punishable; but much more to affront or injure a *master*, a *parent*, or a *magistrate*.

* Deut. xxxii. 4.

gistrate. And in all cases the guilt is heightened, in proportion to the eminency and superiority of the injured party.

If then the desert of sin is to be measured by the excellency and dignity of the person against whom it is committed, when the offence is given to a Being of infinite perfections and supreme dominion, it must, as hath already been observed, have infinite demerit attending it; consequently it is deserving of infinite punishment. And as no created being can possibly bear infinite punishment with respect to intenseness, it must necessarily be eternal as to its duration.

NEO. So far the reasoning seems clear: But what express declarations of scripture are there relative to this?

PHIL. The threatning denounced against our first parent, in case he should transgress the positive command of God, is as explicit as possible. *In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die**. Now, 'this threatning was denounced, not only to signify God's will to punish sin, or the certain event that should follow upon it, but as a motive to obedience; and therefore it includes in it a promise of life, in case he retained his integrity.' And the life which God promised him was, as I think is evident from various passages of the sacred
volume

* Gen. ii. 17.

Dial. X. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 11

volume *, *eternal* life ; or the blessedness of the heavenly state †.

The *death* then contained in the threatening, as the punishment of man's disobedience, was opposed, not only to the life which he was the happy subject of while in a state of innocency, but also to that life which he would have enjoyed, if he had never sinned. For, 'the threatnings and promises, that are sanctions of a law, are set in direct opposition : And the promised rewards and threatned punishments, are what are most properly taken as each others opposites.'

Indeed, eternal death is what the scripture invariably and frequently speaks of, as the certain consequence of sin. *The wages of sin is death* § ; eternal death undoubtedly is meant. Again : *Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death* †. I shall only produce another passage, which however may serve as a comment upon the whole : *The fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone : Which is the SECOND DEATH.* ||

NEO.

* Rom. vii. 10. Ibid viii. 3. Gal. iii. 22. Rom. x. 5, &c.

† We believe, God promised Adam life *eternal*, that is, the most perfect fruition of himself, and that for *ever*, after finishing his course of obedience. See Witfius's Economy of the Covenants, vol. 1, page 83. In which, and some subsequent pages, the above position is proved, I think, in an indisputable manner. § Rom. vi. 21. † James i. 15.

|| Rev. xxi. 8.

NEO. That death, eternal death, is the sanction of the law, I firmly believe, seeing the scripture is so explicit to the point; and therefore the nature of the crime, I should imagine, must highly deserve it.

PHIL. Doubtless: For, to inflict a punishment greater than the crime, is tyranny in any government; and, on the other hand, to order it less than the offence is folly. Seeing then the excellencies of the Divine Nature are so inconceivably great, and the obligations of the creature so exceedingly strong, it should seem that, the Supreme Being had not acted like a righteous governor, had he not denounced death against the transgressor, in order that *every transgression and disobedience might receive a just recompence of reward* *.

Now, man having sinned against his Maker and Sovereign; having violated in the most shameless manner, the sacred precepts of Jehovah, it became necessary in order to preserve the honour of the law, either that its sanction should be inflicted on the delinquent, or on some other person in his stead. Except therefore some means had been devised for the removal of guilt from the transgressor, so as that the law might have been *magnified and made honourable* †, he must certainly, as appears evident from the nature of the law, have borne its awful, though righteous penalty.

NEO.

* Heb. ii. 1. † Isa. xlii. 21.

Dial. X. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 13

NEO. But it is asked, "Are the laws of the Almighty, like those of *Draco*, all written in blood? Has not every governor and lawgiver a power to remit the penalty, either in whole or part, as he sees will be most conducive to public good?"

PHIL. If "the laws of God require perfect obedience;" if supposing "a man fall short of it, he *must* submit to the penalty, whatever that penalty be;" and if unless this was the case "they would be good for nothing," all which is asserted by one of our learned opponents, with what degree of propriety can your questions be proposed?—Supposing we should allow that a *human* governor has such a power as you have specified, yet according to the above concessions, "if a man fall short of obedience to the laws of God, he must submit to the penalty, whatever that penalty be; else those laws," notwithstanding their divine original, "would be good for nothing."

NEO. The concessions you have mentioned, do indeed strongly evince the absolute necessity of satisfaction, in order to free the sinner from impending ruin.

PHIL. Ay certainly: For, if "a man *must* submit to the penalty, whatever that penalty be," then doubtless he must *necessarily* submit to it. *Necessarily*, that is, unless some expedient can be devised to deliver him from it, consist-

VOL. II. B ently

ently with the honour of the divine law ; for, ' if the law is not executed, the design, even the principle design of punishment in this case is not reached.'

NEO. Pray, what is the principal design of punishment ? Is it not " the public good ?"

PHIL. In all *human* governments, " public good is, or ought to be the reason and rule of punishment." But the analogy will not hold in all cases between the Divine government, and the governments of men. In *these*, " the governor and government are both constituted for the good of the governed, which therefore must be the chief aim of all laws. On the contrary, with respect to the Divine government, the *governed* are made, and the *laws* made, and *penalties enacted* for the GOVERNOR, who *made all things for himself* * ; and consequently, the principal design of punishment is, The securing and vindicating of his honour in the government."

Permit me to add further, that, by comparing the Divine law with human ones, we may very soon fall into the most palpable and dangerous mistakes ; for, *these* are often very unjust and iniquitous, whereas *that is a law of truth and without iniquity, just and right* § in all its parts.

NEO.

* Prov. xvi. 4. and Rev. iv, 11.

§ Deut, xxxii. 4.

Dial. X. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 15

NEO. Some persons think, that "to say that every the least error in moral life deserves eternal torments, is a hard saying," and ask, "Who can bear it?"

PHIL. Had the persons who question in that manner, heard our Lord's sermon upon the mount, they would, I make no doubt, have quarrelled with many of the sentences which compose that admirable discourse. Especially when the Divine teacher declares, *Whoever shall say, THOU FOOL, shall be in danger of hell-fire* †. But, notwithstanding all the cavils of purblind mortals, *heaven and earth shall pass away*, before one single expression of God's word shall fail.

The law of God must be inexorably strict in all its demands. If it indeed be the expression of his will; if it be a rule of righteousness to his creatures; if, in short, it have its foundation in his infinite and matchless perfections; then, unquestionably it must, like its all-glorious Author, admit of *no variableness nor shadow of turning*.

Were the law of God to admit of any deviation; were it to be relaxed in any one instance; it would entirely destroy its uncontrollable authority, and bring unavoidable reflections upon the great Legislator. It would demonstrably prove, that the Divine Being could connive at sin, and suffer the delinquent to pass unpunished. And if this might be done in one

B 2 instance,

† Matt. v. 22.

instance, why not in two? And if in two, why not in twenty? And so on to an endless number.

Indeed, according to this hypothesis, we shall be entirely at a loss to know what, or how many sins God will pardon; the consequence of which would be; ‘That every man would be a lawgiver to himself, and, with supposed allowance from God, make his own *will* and *pleasure* the rule of his obedience.’

NEO. Is there “no room, then, for mercy under the government of a merciful God?”

PHIL. Yes; “had not God been merciful, essentially so, he would have destroyed his moral offspring the very moment they had offended. Had not mercy been his characteristic, he would not have sent Christ into the world at all;” who is therefore represented as a fruit of Divine mercy *. But let us consult the scripture in reference to this: You will abide by its decisions?

NEO. Certainly.

PHIL. When Moses so earnestly requested a discovery of the Divine Character, it was proclaimed before him in the following words. *The Lord, the Lord God, MERCIFUL and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty* §. From which declaration

* Luke i. 78.

§ Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7.

Dial. X. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 17

tion we learn that, notwithstanding the infinite clemency of the Divine Majesty, yet he will not, upon any account, pass over sin with impunity.

That there is room for mercy under the government of a merciful God, is a glorious and well-attested truth, *and* undoubtedly is *worthy of all acceptation*. But, then, mercy will never display her charms to the disadvantage of justice, nor in a way in the least injurious to the honour of the Divine government. Had not God been merciful; nay, had he not been *abundant* in mercy, none of the guilty and polluted race of Adam had ever been brought to enjoy the Divine favour, or been made the happy subjects of his grace.

So that, though it be a glorious and heart-reviving truth, that there is inconceivable, yea infinite mercy in the ever-blessed God; though this attribute, to use the sweet and expressive language of the scripture, be *great above the heavens* §, yet it is equally true on the other hand, that the exercise of it, in respect to its objects is limited by his other perfections: And therefore he will never exert it, to the dishonour and injury of any of them. Indeed, were he to exercise it in such a manner, as in the least to affect the honour of his law, it would cease to be a perfection of his nature, and would degenerate into foolish pity.

B 3

NEO.

* Psal. cviii. 4.

NEO. But "whatever necessity there may be for punishing licentious and incorrigible characters, there cannot," it is said, "be the same necessity for punishing penitent and reformed ones."

PHIL. Real penitence and reformation is not to be found in any subject, but such as are taught of God; and, by the sweet and powerful teachings of his Spirit, led to Christ for salvation. Persons indeed may have something which appears *like* repentance, when, at the same time, it is far from being the thing itself. Our first parent, for instance, it should seem, had some blushes: he *hid himself**; but then they were occasioned more by the discovery of the crime, than from any sense of the evil that attended it, and so it was a repentance that respected himself, and not the glory of God, and therefore was of no value.

If however we can suppose a person a subject of *real* penitence, who at the same time has no reliance upon Christ, there would, in my opinion, be an absolute necessity for the punishment of that person.

NEO. How will you prove that?

PHIL. In this manner: The law of God, as we have already shewn, is inexorable in its demands, and unchangeable in its requirements.

The

* Gen. iii. 3.

Dial. X. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 19

The law is not of faith; it knows nothing of faith in the grand point of the justification of a sinner; and I may add as little of repentance. The object which the law requires is obedience. Obedience perfect and complete, and, in case of failure, it leaves men to the severity of its sanction which they have so justly incurred: The man that DOETH them, that is, the precepts of the law, shall live in them. And faith itself only justifies, as it receives that righteousness which is exhibited in the gospel from faith to faith§. Hence we are told, that CHRIST is the END of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth†.*

On the other hand, its language is, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them†. It denounces its anathema's against the transgressor; and, being perfectly holy in its own nature, as well as just and good||, it cannot connive at the least degree of unholiness, in any who are under it.—Unless then there be something in the nature of repentance, which is equivalent to perfect obedience, the sentence of the law must certainly be executed; nor can repentance, how real and genuine soever, possibly render that execution unjust, which is according to the sanction of the law, provided that law be not an iniquitous one.*

If you please I will illustrate this by a simile.

NEO.

* Gal. iii. 12. § Rom. i. 17. † Rom. x. 4. ‡ Gal. iii. 10.
|| Rom. vii. 12.

NEO. I wish you would ; for they often times convey the clearest ideas of truth to the mind,

PHIL. Suppose then that a person, a subject of our happy clime, had received some signal favours from our illustrious sovereign, and yet, notwithstanding all those repeated instances of kindness, he should be found combined in a horrid conspiracy against him ; Would repentance be thought a sufficient reparation for such a crime ? Or would the law admit of that instead of death ?

NEO. No : But does not the scripture declare that the penitent shall be pardoned ?

PHIL. The scripture declares that penitence is required in the subject to be pardoned, but not that repentance is the *cause* of pardon. God, indeed, remits the sins of none but penitents, but then those penitents are such as have a true reliance upon the Lord Jesus Christ, as the only sure foundation for a guilty sinner to build upon. It is *through this man* *, namely, the man Christ Jesus, that pardon is proclaimed to rebellious creatures. And therefore, those *little children*, of whom the apostle speaks, whose sins were forgiven, were such as *believed in the name of the Son of God* §. They were not only real penitents, but also sound believers.

Upon

* Acts xiii, 38. § 1 John ii, 12. Ibid v, 13.

Dial. X. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 21

Upon the whole then, the *nature* of the law is, I think, a strong proof, that a satisfaction, in the case we are considering, was absolutely necessary.

NEO. I think so too: However I should be glad if you would proceed to consider the other arguments which you have to offer upon this subject.

PHIL. My leisure time for the present is entirely elapsed, so that I cannot with convenience proceed any further; only indulge me with this reflection: Is the law of God so extensive in its requirements, and so awful in its sanction! How deplorable is the situation of those, of the fallen race of Adam, who are seeking life by it; and refuse to *submit to the righteousness of God*†; to that *righteousness which is of God by faith*||! They are still under its direful curse, and, continuing in such a state, must feel its awful effects through the ages of eternity.

† Rom. x. 3. || Phil. iii. 9.

DIALOGUE XI.

NEOPHYTUS. **S**INCE our last conversation, I have thought much on what was the principal topic of it; and, from the observations that were made upon the *nature* of the law, am fully convinced, that, if the transgressor of it were delivered from punishment, a satisfaction was absolutely necessary to vindicate its honour, and preserve it from that disrespectful, contemptuous treatment, which otherwise it would certainly meet with.

PHILANTHROPOS. I am glad to hear, that the arguments urged, have had such weight upon your mind.—Hoping that you may acquire still further light upon the subject, I will now add, that such a satisfaction as we have already stated, was equally necessary in regard of the *Divine perfections*.

NEO. Is the scripture clear in asserting that?

PHIL. Exceedingly clear: The author of the epistle to the Hebrews affirms, that, **IT BECAME**

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 23

CAME HIM *for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings* *.——It became him; that is, it was perfectly congruous to his character, as a God of inflexible justice, infinite holiness, and inviolable veracity, to save guilty sinners, if saved at all, in this way. For, it is observable, that the bringing of many sons unto glory, by the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, gives the brightest lustre to the Divine perfections, in the eyes of all intellectual creatures, who behold the amazing transaction. Yes; in the great High Priest of our profession, the perfections of Deity are, as it were, collected into a point, like the rays of light in a mirror; and reflect the greatest honour on that all-glorious Being, with whom is *terrible majesty*, as well as forgiveness and mercy.

That the Sovereign of heaven therefore might, to all the subjects of his universal empire, appear *a just God and a Saviour* †; he *saw fit*, by so unparalleled a procedure, to deliver guilty man from impending, and otherwise inevitable destruction.

NEO. If the Divine Being, in order to deliver guilty man from impending ruin, saw fit that so important an event as Christ's obedience unto death should take place, then doubtless it was necessary. And indeed the persons I have met

* Heb. ii. 10.

† Is. xlv. 21.

met with, who oppose the doctrine of satisfaction, will in general allow this. For, they affirm, "that God cannot do what is not fit and expedient to be done. And, if it was not fit and expedient to forgive sin without the interposition of such an expiation or atonement," as that of the Lord Jesus Christ, "then that atonement was really necessary to our obtaining pardon."

PHIL. According to that reasoning, our doctrine, respecting satisfaction, is fully proved from the above-cited text. For, the expediency of it is there plainly and strongly asserted. Its meaning is, 'not only that the course God took was well *worthy* of him, but that *in order to act worthy of himself*, it was expedient he should take this method.' The conclusion then that we draw from it, and which we think is evidently contained in it, is this; That God, considered as the moral Governor of the universe, could not, consistently with the righteousness of his administration, pardon sinners, or bring them to glory, without the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ.

NEO. The passage, I own, strikes my mind considerably: It appears strong and forcible. For, if it was requisite, for the bringing of sinners to glory, that the Captain of our salvation should be perfect through sufferings; then, surely, those sufferings must have been necessary for the effecting of so gracious a design. PHIL.

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 25

PHIL. Ay, certainly : Unless there had been an absolute necessity ; unless there had been a knot too hard for any but Deity to untie, the Eternal Word, who *was with God, and was God*, would never surely have descended upon the scene of this world, to unravel the perplexing affair. Had *burnt-offerings, and sin-offerings*, been sufficient for the expiation of moral evil ; nay, if any law had been given which could have given life, the all-glorious Redeemer would never have said, *Lo, I come* *. But we will consider this more particularly afterwards.

——— Let us now attend a little to the argument taken from the *justice* of God, in proof of our present subject of enquiry.

NEO. Very well : Be so kind then as explain to me a little, the precise *nature* of the Divine justice ; that I may have a clear and distinct idea of the term. Is it “ a principle opposite to goodness, or is it *only* a modification of it ? ”

PHIL. The scriptures frequently assert that God is *just*. *A God of truth, and without iniquity, JUST and RIGHT is he* †. *A JUST God and a Saviour* §. *The JUST Lord is in the midst thereof* ‡.

Now, by these expressions, and others similar to them, we are, I think, to understand, that the Divine Being necessarily hates sin, and consequently is highly displeased with the workers

VOL. II. C of

* Psal. xl. 6, 7.

† Deut. xxxii. 4.

§ Is. xlv. 21.

‡ Zeph. iii. 5.

of it; and will by no means suffer it to go unpunished. For, *justice*, in general, is that principle of the mind by which we are disposed to give every one his due. The justice of God therefore is that perfection of his nature, in consequence of which he punishes the transgressors of his law, by executing upon them that tremendous, but righteous sanction, which he has annexed to the violation of it. And if by “a modification of goodness,” you mean an expression of his kindness, as the moral Governor of the universe, to the community in general over which he reigns, then his justice is not, I believe, “a principle opposite to goodness,” but only “a modification of it.” For, such a procedure has doubtless a powerful tendency to prevent sin — to promote the happiness of his universal empire — and to render his administration peculiarly amiable.

NEO. But I am told, that “the Supreme Being is not under any necessity of *nature* to punish or reward, but is determined by wisdom and goodness.” And that “were he under a *necessity of nature* to punish, neither repentance nor a supposed satisfaction would signify any thing at all.”

PHIL. Though the Supreme Being, in every part of his administration, is determined by wisdom and goodness, yet *that*, I should think, is no proof at all, that he is not absolutely *necessi-*

tated

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 27

tated to punish. For, whatever is *best*, and most fit to be done, *that*, our opponents themselves being judges, an All-wise Being must *necessarily* do.

For instance: *He cannot* the scripture assures us *deny himself* *. And undoubtedly he is determined by wisdom and goodness in this. Again: we are told that he *will by no means clear the guilty* †: That *his wrath is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men* §: That *tribulation and wrath shall come upon every soul of man that doeth evil, both Jew and Gentile* ‡.

Now, God is certainly determined by wisdom and goodness to execute these threatnings, and yet doubtless he does it *necessarily*. For, to suppose that he can suffer sin to pass unpunished, is to suppose that he may *eternally* do it; and therefore, were this reasoning true, the creature might eternally sin against him without ever being punished for his horrid rebellion. But no person, I apprehend, will affirm this. Its absurdity indeed is too great to be admitted for a moment.

However, to set this matter in as clear a light as possible, we will consider a passage in the sacred volume, which, I think, clearly and irrefragably proves, that the *justice* of God rendered a satisfaction necessary.

C 2

The

* 2 Tim. ii, 13.

† Exod. xxxiv, 7.

§ Rom. i, 18.

‡ Ibid. ii, 8, 9.

NEO. The word of God is undoubtedly the final judge of every religious sentiment ; I shall be glad therefore to hear the decision which it gives in the case before us, seeing I would always form my judgment entirely by that.

PHIL. The apostle Paul, in his letter to the church at Rome, declares, that *all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God ; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ : Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, TO DECLARE HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God : to declare, I say, at this time HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS ; that he might be JUST, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus **.

Which declaration clearly evinces, if language can be sufficiently expressive, That the justice, or righteousness of God rendered the punishment of sin *necessary*, either in the sinner himself or in the Surety. And that the primary design of the death of Christ, when he suffered the just for the unjust, was *to declare, or exhibit*, to all who should be spectators of the amazing transaction, the infinite rectitude of the Divine Nature, even in the pardoning and justifying of a guilty sinner.

NEO. But does not the apostle rather mean, “ that in the gospel of Christ, which was confirmed by his death and resurrection, the Di-

vine

* Romans iii, 24,—27.

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 29

vine Being, as from a *mercy seat* (which" it is said, "the word ought to be rendered, and not propitiation) declares his goodness and mercy to mankind?"

PHIL. No; "if you consider the whole of the passage, and the connection in which it stands, you will be satisfied, that the apostle is here asserting," not only that the Divine Being declares "his goodness and mercy to mankind," through the propitiation of Christ, but also the *essential rectitude* of his nature: That rectitude which induces him to inflict the righteous sentence of his law upon the transgressors of it; and by which, as in a mirror, he discovers the great demerit of sin—his intense hatred to it—and how unbecoming it is for him to have fellowship with the sinner at the expence of his own glory.

NEO. The text indeed seems express to that purpose: *That he might be JUST, and the Justifier.*

PHIL. Right: 'That he might evidence himself to be strictly and inviolably righteous, in the administration of his government; even while he is the all-forgiving, gracious Justifier of him who believes in Jesus.'

And you will remember, that the manner *how* this could be effected, is matter of pure revelation. Sin had so perplexed matters, and involved them in such a labyrinth of difficulties, that how Divine justice could be honour-

ed in the justification of a sinner, was a thing far too high for human sagacity to devise.

Notwithstanding then that, in the propitiation of Christ, there is the brightest display of "goodness and mercy to mankind;" though the gift of the only begotten Son of God be, as it were, the central point, where the rays of divine love are collected together*; yet to exhibit *these* is not the design of the apostle in the text we are considering. But, his intention evidently is what has already been affirmed; namely, to shew that God is just, and perfectly righteous, even in the justifying of an *ungodly sinner* †, who *believes with the heart unto righteousness* ‡ and life ||.

On the whole; we may, I think, fairly conclude, from the above text, that not only the *law* of God, but also his *justice* required a satisfaction for sin; and that without it rebellious creatures could not, consistently with the honour of the Divine administration, either be released from an obligation to punishment, or admitted to the enjoyment of the favour of God.

NEO. "But you do not," it is said, "conceive of the Supreme Being as of an ambitious, passionate, and revengeful Monarch, who, upon every slight provocation, is for carrying fire and sword into his neighbour's territory, insisting on

* 1 Joh. iv. 10.

† Rom. iv. 5.

‡ Ibid x. 10.

|| 1 Joh. v. 12.

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 31

on rigorous satisfaction for real or supposed injuries ?”

PHIL. No ; very far from it. *The judge of all the earth*, the supreme and righteous Governor of the world, who does according to his will, both in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, will certainly *do right* *. “ Such a character disgraces even the man, and cannot without blasphemy be ascribed to God.” An ambitious, passionate, and revengeful Monarch ! Far be it ! On the contrary, his distinguishing characteristic, we have sufficient authority to say, is love. *God is love* †.

But then, a public ruler, in punishing a transgressor according to law, ought not to be considered as “ an ambitious, passionate, and revengeful person.” For, “ punishment is by no means an act of *revenge*, either in God or man.” Such an earthly ruler, as has been described, when executing the sentence of the law, is by no means to be viewed in the point of light you have mentioned ; but, on the contrary, he should be highly esteemed for his honourable, equitable, and faultless procedure.

When the great JEHOVAH therefore, the absolute Sovereign of heaven and earth, executes the penalty of his holy law, it is not surely to gratify “ ambition, passion, or revenge,” but to preserve his righteous law, and himself as the great Law-giver, from that disrespect

* Gen. xviii. 25. † 1 Joh. iv. 8.

respect and contempt, to which they would otherwise be liable. The Divine Majesty is not to be considered “in the light of a tyrant,” who acts towards his subjects in an arbitrary, cruel, and iniquitous manner; but as a Being who is perfectly *righteous in all his ways*, as well as *holy in all his works* *. And I make no doubt but that, notwithstanding the cavils of purblind mortals, the Almighty will *be justified when he speaketh*, and *clear when he judgeth* †.

NEO. I see the insinuation is very unbecoming, and seems designed to intimidate honest minds from receiving the truth in the love of it.

PHIL. Yes; if this be the truth, the author you refer to will be found to have made use of terms very unbecoming the Majesty of heaven and earth, and which express too much of the “ambition, passion, and revenge,” which are to be found in worms of earth. It appears to me very similar, to what the scripture calls, *charging God foolishly* §. It reminds me of that awful declaration, *Let the potsherd strive with the potsherd of the earth, but wo to him that striveth with his Maker* †.

NEO. I am now fully convinced, that, the justice of God being admitted, the absolute necessity of the satisfaction of Christ, in order to the pardon of sin, in a way honourable to the
Divine

* Psal. cxlv. 17. † Psal. li. 4. § Job i. 22. † Isa. xlv. 9.

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 33

Divine government, is strongly, nay, I think, indisputably enforced.

PHIL. I am glad that you see things in the point of light they have been represented in to you. I shall therefore be very concise in what I would further say upon this part of the subject.

NEO. I think you intimated, that the "infinite holiness" of God, as well as his justice, required a satisfaction to be made.

PHIL. I did: And I think it is proveable from many considerations.

NEO. You will favour me with one or two of them.

PHIL. The Supreme Being is said to be *glorious in holiness* *, and of purer eyes than to behold evil †; that is, with approbation. As the nature of God is absolutely holy, so he must necessarily hate whatever is contrary to holiness. Hence we are told, in the most express terms, that *he hates all the workers of iniquity* ‡; and that *he is angry with the wicked every day* §. Now, seeing the Sovereign of heaven and earth is so holy a Being, he cannot but determine to punish sin, and afterwards execute that determination.

Unless then some expedient had been devised for the removal of sin from the sinner; unless some sufficient reparation had been made for the disparagement

* Exod. xv. 11. † Habbak. i. 13. ‡ Psal. v. 5. § Ibid vii. 11.

disparagement of infinite holiness; we, being sinners against God, could never, as appears from the above declarations, either have been restored to the enjoyment of the Divine favour, or have been *called the sons of God* *.

No; with respect to all who are transgressors of his law, he is, the scripture assures us, *a consuming fire* †. He is obliged, if I may so speak, from a necessity of nature, to punish all sin, and even that which he designs to pardon. And, if the rights of his holiness were not secured, he *would*, to use the striking language of the prophet, *go through the briers and thorns*, i. e. all ungodly rebellious sinners, yea, he *would burn them together* §. Hence the captain of the chosen tribes, when he was about to lay down his commission, *said to the people, Ye CANNOT serve the Lord; for he is an HOLY God* ‡. For the same reason, no sinner can possibly have fellowship with him, but through a Mediator.

NEO. I see clearly that *the throne of iniquity* can have no *fellowship with God* ||, and that, before he can indulge such a person with the *light of his countenance* **, his iniquity must be expiated.

PHIL. Surely; and therefore the holiness of God required that such a satisfaction should be made.—Let us now attend a little to the argument taken from the Divine *veracity*.

NEO.

* 1 Joh. iii. 1. † Heb. xii. 29. § Is. xxvii. 4. ‡ Jos. xxiv. 19.

|| Psal. xciv. 20. ** Ibid lxxxix. 14.

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 35

NEO. Very well : How does that evince the doctrine we are speaking of ?

PHIL. You know that when God entered into covenant with our first parents, *death* was threatned as the sanction of their law. *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely DIE* *.

NEO. And what do you infer from that ?

PHIL. Why, that the sentence was immutable : For, had it been revoked, without inflicting the punishment, the veracity of God, with respect to his word, could not have been vindicated ; but, on the contrary, his faithfulness must have failed, which the scripture assures us can never be the case †. Man then having violated the law of his Creator, it became necessary, absolutely necessary, that the penalty should be inflicted, either upon the sinner himself, or upon some other person, who was able and willing to bear it, in his stead. ' For, the judgment of God is, that such a person is worthy of death ; and his judgment is always according to truth, and therefore will certainly take place.'

NEO. Is it agreeable to the veracity of God to admit of a substitute ?

PHIL. Yes ; for, though death was the penalty annexed to the transgression of the law, yet a surety was not excluded. No such limiting clause

* Gen. ii. 17. † Psal. lxxxix. 33.

clause was inserted : If it had, then doubtless man had been irrecoverably miserable. The penalty indeed could not be revoked ; death was threatned, and consequently must be inflicted. But then a change of persons was admissible ; if, by such a change, the honour of the Divine government could be properly secured, and the perfections of the great Lawgiver preserved inviolate.

The great Jehovah was indeed under no obligation to admit of a surety ; he might justly have required payment of the sinner himself ; but, of his rich mercy, and infinite love, he first provided, and then accepted of a Surety in our place and stead.

NEO. I think you said that “ the design of our Lord’s coming into the world, and the means by which that important end was attained, would add considerable weight to the argument for the necessity of satisfaction.”

PHIL. I did : And this I will now endeavour to give proof of.

The design then, the noble and important design, to effect which the Eternal Word assumed our nature, and appeared in our world, was, he himself repeatedly declared, *To seek and save that which was lost* *. — *That the world through him might be saved* †. — *That they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly* §.

Which

* Luk. xix. 10. † Joh. iii. 17. § Ibid. x. 10.

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 37

Which declarations of our Lord, perfectly agree with the sweet and expressive name given to him by the angel previous to his birth. *Thou shalt*, said the heavenly messenger to his reputed father, *call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins* *. So that the great object of the life and death of Christ, as evidently appears from his own declarations, was, to accomplish the salvation of guilty man. To accomplish a salvation, by which all the perfections of Deity are glorified *in the highest*; the rights of the Divine government inviolably secured; a door of hope opened to the most flagrant transgressor; and the felicity of the believer completely provided for.

NEO. An important object indeed! A salvation in all its parts worthy of a God! But what were the means by which this most glorious end was attained?

PHIL. The means were, A perfect conformity to the precept of the law, and a suffering of the penalty annexed to the violation of it.

NEO. Does our Saviour himself, in any part of his discourses, speak of his undertaking in that view?

PHIL. Very clearly: With respect to the former part of the requirement, that is, a conformity

VOL. II.

D

for nity

* Matt. i. 21.

formity to the precept of the law, he declared that, *His meat and drink was to do the will of his Father, and to FINISH HIS WORK* *. And in his intercessionary prayer, he says, *I have finished the work which thou gavest me TO DO* †. And again: *For their sakes I SANCTIFY MYSELF, that they also might be sanctified through the truth* ||.

NEO. You apprehend then, that it was not sufficient for the purposes of complete salvation, that Christ should suffer the *penalty* of the law; but that, in order to accomplish so important a design, it was equally necessary that he should yeild obedience to the *precepts* of it.

PHIL. That is my opinion; and, I should imagine, that the texts now quoted sufficiently prove it.

NEO. As I have lately heard it questioned, nay, peremptorily denied, if you have any other reasons for the support of it, I shall be glad to hear them.

PHIL. With the greatest pleasure; for I would not advance the least step, without carrying light and certainty along with us.

Let it be observed then, that the law promises life only to the *doer* of it. Its uniform language is, *The man that DOETH those things shall live by them* §. So that, supposing a sinner freed from its curse, though he might by that means be

* John iv. 34. † John xvii. 4. || Ver. 19. § Rom. x. 5.

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 39

be restored to the Divine favour, and brought into the same situation that Adam was in before he fell, yet he could not possibly have any claim to eternal glory. When therefore Christ is said to be *the END of the law for righteousness**, we must certainly understand the declaration to mean, that he perfectly obeyed the law; seeing obedience was what it indispensably required, and without which the life promised could never have been enjoyed.

Again: It is, the scripture assures us, *by the RIGHTEOUSNESS of one*, that the free gift comes upon all men, that is, upon all believers, unto justification of life §. Now, all righteousness must consist in a conformity to some law; and the righteousness by which a person is justified, must be a conformity to that very law which justifies him. The righteousness of that *one* therefore, in consequence of which eternal life is conferred upon believers, must consist in obedience to the law.

Once more: The apostle asserts that, *as by one man's DISOBEDIENCE many were made sinners; so by the OBEDIENCE of one, shall many be made righteous* ||. Now, it is allowed on all hands, that, if men were made sinners at all by the disobedience of one, it must have been by his *active* disobedience; consequently, by parity of reason, we must, in opposition to the former, be made righteous by an *active* obedience.

D 2

NEO.

* Rom. x. 4. § Ibid v. 18. || Ver. 19.

NEO. I am satisfied as to this : Please therefore to proceed to what you have further in view.

PHIL. With respect to the latter part of the assertion, concerning the means by which guilty sinners are delivered from the wrath to come, to wit, Christ's suffering the penalty which was due to the transgressor, let the following declarations be impartially considered.

As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so MUST the Son of man be lifted up. From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he MUST go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief-priests, and scribes, and be killed §, OUGHT NOT Christ to have suffered these things †. It BEHOVED Christ to suffer ‡.*

So that from these plain testimonies, the necessity of the satisfaction of Jesus, in consequence of his covenant-engagements, will I hope, appear to you with still brighter evidence.

NEO. The evidence, indeed, is strong and forcible ; and as our Lord himself has so expressly asserted it, I am surely under the strongest obligations implicitly to believe it. Indeed, I should think, that the thing sufficiently speaks for itself. Either Christ suffered for sin or he did not. If he did not, then his sufferings have no relation at all to us ; any farther than in

* John iii. 14. § Matt. xvi. 21. † Luke xxiv. 36. ‡ Ibid 46.

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 41

in order to set us an example of patiently suffering death for our religion, and the good of mankind. If he did, then those sufferings must have been absolutely necessary.

PHIL. Your observation is unquestionably just. The death of Christ, if it be indeed vicarious, which I hope demonstrably to prove, is certainly a strong, and irrefragable argument, to evince the absolute necessity of it. For, what probable cause can be assigned, why the Father of mercies should, if there were no necessity, make his beloved Son, in whom he was well pleased, a curse and execration for us? Does he ever punish an innocent person? Certainly not. *Who ever perished, being innocent? or where were the righteous cut off?*

That affecting prayer of our Saviour, which he presented to his Father in the garden of Gethsemane, is, in my opinion, a sufficient indication, that no other expedient could be devised, for the salvation of guilty man. For, as Christ was always heard by the Father; as he was the *dear*, and *well-beloved* Son of God; and as the petition that the cup of suffering might be removed from him, was urged in so repeated, and vehement a manner; that his death was indispensably necessary for the redemption of sinners, is a fair and natural consequence.

Nay, we may, for the truth of this, appeal to the conscience of every unprejudiced person;

D 3

and

* Job iv. 7.

and ask, Whether, upon the supposition that God might have pardoned sin by the bare act of his power or mercy, it be probable that he would have taken pleasure in *bruising, wounding, and putting to grief*, his best-beloved, and *only-begotten Son*? Whether we can admit the thought, that God should send his Son into the world, to endure all those miseries he met with, in his soul and body, from enemies, friends, men, and devils, and from his own immediate hand too, without any real occasion for it? No; had there not been an absolute, an indispensable necessity for so unparalelled an act, the sword of vindictive justice had certainly never been unsheathed, nor have *smitten the man who was God's fellow* *.

NEO. The *necessity* of the satisfaction of the Lord Jesus Christ, appears to me now extremely obvious. I see that the honour of the divine administration, if guilty man were saved, indispensably required it. So that my mind cordially acquiesces in it.

PHIL. *Blessed*, says our Lord, *is he who soever shall not be offended in me* §. And surely, far from being offended, every guilty sinner should greatly rejoice in him; seeing it is by him only that the justice of God is satisfied, his law perfectly fulfilled, his truth secured, and his holiness vindicated.

NEO.

* Zach. xiii. 7.

§ Matt. xi. 6.

Dial. XI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 43

NEO. But "if it had been inconsistent with the divine justice to pardon sin upon repentance only, without some farther satisfaction, we might," it is said, "have expected to have found it *expressly said to be so* in the scriptures; but no such declaration can be produced either from the Old or the New Testament."

PHIL. The person to whom you refer, and who exclaims so loudly against the doctrine of satisfaction, may not, perhaps, have perused his Bible with a sufficient degree of attention, to pronounce, in so confident a manner, a long-established doctrine to be entirely devoid of any scriptural foundation. Nay, he may, probably, have been under the power of a prejudiced mind, and, like a man in the jaundice, have been deceived by false, or disguised appearances.

Assertions however there are in the scripture, which, if they do not expressly *declare that it is so*, yet, I think, clearly evince the truth of the fact. Indeed, the text which we have already quoted may be urged with sufficient propriety, as an undeniable proof, that, 'to pardon sin upon repentance only,' was inconsistent with the Divine Character.

Whom, i. e. Christ, God hath set forth to be a propitiation, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, that he might be JUST, and the JUSTIFIER of him that believeth in Jesus.—But, what need could there be of a propitiation, to obtain the remission of sins, if repentance were

44. ON THE NECESSITY Dial. XI.

sufficient for that purpose? Or are the terms *propitiation* and *repentance* synonymous? If they are not, so long as the New Testament is of any validity, we must conclude that something very different from repentance was required, to the blotting out of sin; that is, a satisfaction of infinite value.

However, if such a satisfaction was actually made; if the Lord Jesus Christ was considered as the substitute of sinners; if, in a word, his sufferings were properly vicarious; then *that* satisfaction, and *these* sufferings were absolutely necessary.

NEO. You will be so kind as give the proof of what you have now observed.

PHIL. That I would do immediately, but, as our time is gone, it must be deferred to another opportunity. Only I would observe that, according to our mode of representing the subject in debate, the Supreme Being appears,

*A God all o'er, consummate, absolute,
Full-orb'd, in his whole round of rays complete.*

Whereas, the opposers of satisfaction

*—set at odds Heaven's jarring attributes;
And, with one excellence, another wound;
Maim Heaven's perfection, break its equal beams,
Bid MERCY triumph over—God himself,
Undeify'd by their opprobrious praise:
A God ALL mercy, is a God unjust.*

D I A-

DIALOGUE XII.

NEO. **W**ELL, fir; I have been a little impatient at your stay to night. Your conversation yesterday evening was so agreeably instructive, that I longed much to hear you again upon the same important subject.

PHIL. Such conferences are very useful, among those who love truth, and talk with temper. For, by conversation we have an opportunity given us of digesting our ideas, and reducing them to a clearness and consistency which they could never attain in the darkness of silent meditation.—Shall we begin at the point where we left off yesterday?

NEO. Ay, do; for I could wish to have the subject examined to the bottom.

PHIL. What we are now to attend to then is, the *proof* that the satisfaction of Christ, in the sense already explained, was actually made.

NEO.

NEO. That is what I now wait for, and which I hope you will proceed to give.

PHIL. In the first declaration of grace made to guilty man, which is as it were the ore and bullion of all evangelical discoveries, we have not the least intimation, not the most distant hint, that repentance was to be the condition of his final acceptance. On the contrary, we are expressly assured, by Him, *who cannot lie*, that their deliverance was to be effected solely by the bruising of that illustrious personage, represented to us under the character of the woman's seed.

NEO. You refer I suppose to what God said to our first parents, upon the occasion of their disobedience to his positive command.

PHIL. I do: The words of this most glorious declaration are, *I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; It, or rather HE *, shall bruise thy head, and THOU SHALT bruise his heel†.* Which words, though they were denounced immediately against the serpent, yet contain an admirable compendium of the gospel scheme, and point out the only way of salvation for guilty man. They declare, as illustrated by an infallible commentator, that this important work should

* **אֵל** *A Being.* One that exists. It is used as one of the names of God, Psal. cii. 27, and Is. xliii. 10. Parkhurst's Lex. † Gen. iii. 15.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 47

should be effected, not by any penitential tears or after obedience of our own, but by the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ. *He took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham* *. You remember I doubt not for what end he did this?

NEO. *That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil* §.

PHIL. Right: The above declaration then may justly be considered as a model, from which the Divine Being will never deviate, in his future transactions with guilty man. But had repentance been sufficient to conciliate an offended Deity; What need was there for the Seed of the woman to have been bruised? Had “repentance been the condition of final acceptance;” or had it become Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, to have pardoned sin upon repentance; our first parents doubtless would have been expressly told so. Whereas not a single word of this kind is mentioned, or even so much as hinted at; but, on the contrary, the bruising of the woman's seed, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now this, I should imagine, is a direct proof that Christ suffered as the substitute of guilty man.

NEO. Do you think our first parents, when the above declaration was made to them, understood

* Heb. ii. 16. § Verse 15.

stood it in the point of light you have represented it in ?

PHIL. Not perhaps in so clear a manner as we do, to whom *life and immortality are brought to light by the gospel*: It was something like a flower in the bud, which gradually discloses its beauty and fragrancy, till at length it appears in its full bloom, and regales the senses of every beholder. That our first parents however did view it in the point of light which has been mentioned, is, I think, sufficiently clear, from several circumstances recorded in their history ; particularly from the intimation we have of their offering sacrifices.—And since the nature and design of sacrificing, as they are fully represented to us in the sacred oracles, have long appeared to me a striking proof of the satisfaction of Christ ; we will, if you please, give a more close and particular attention to them, in order to throw some further light upon so interesting a point of enquiry.

NEO. The proposal is perfectly agreeable to me ; and the rather, because I have lately heard a pretty warm debate upon that subject ; wherein the Jewish sacrifices were decried as being in a great measure useless.

PHIL. The rite of sacrificing seems to have been nearly coeval with the before-mentioned declaration. For, our first parents, the sacred historian expressly informs us, were, as the
immediate

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 49

immediate consequence of what God had spoken, *clothed with coats made of the skins of beasts* *. And it is very probable, these were the skins of those beasts slain for sacrifices. For, that they were not killed for food is evident, since animal food at that time was actually prohibited. Nor is the supposition, that they were slain simply for the use of their skins, at all probable, seeing *that* in my opinion, were too low and unworthy an end. The first idea then, namely, that they were slain for sacrifices, is by far the most probable, though we cannot affirm it as an absolute certainty.

Besides ; from the circumstances recorded in the history of our first parents, we have sufficient reason to believe, That Adam taught the rite of sacrificing to his children. For, Moses informs us that, both Cain and Abel brought their offering to the Lord † ; which, I should think, they would not have done, had they not received such instructions from their father.

NEO. But what proof is there that this rite was of Divine appointment ?

PHIL. As sacrifices are unquestionably of great antiquity, so we have sufficient evidence that their original was *from heaven, and not of men*. For, we are expressly told, by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, not only that Abel offered a sacrifice, but also that the sacri-

VOL. II.

E

fice

* Gen. iii. 21. † Ibid iv. 3, 4.

fice he offered was pleasing and acceptable in the sight of God. *Abel, says he, offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain; by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God* TESTIFYING OF HIS GIFTS*.

If then sacrifices were offered, and if these sacrifices were acceptable to God, they must certainly have been his express command. For, to suppose that, though there were no divine command for them; though they were acts entirely of human invention; yet that they were acceptable in the sight of God, is, in my opinion, a great reflection on him *whose name is jealous*, and who will not give his glory to another. Had sacrificing been a rite of man's devising, may we not reasonably conclude, That God, so far from testifying his approbation of it, would rather have said, as a token of his displeasure, *Who hath required these things at your hands*.

Moreover; from Adam down to Moses, a period of near two thousand four hundred years, sacrifices were continued to be offered; and the Divine Being by external and evident signs, frequently manifested his particular approbation of them. But this he certainly would not have done, had they not been of his own appointment. So that their divine original is, I should imagine, sufficiently clear, from this single consideration.

NEO.

* Heb. xi. 4.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 51

NEO. But some persons, however, think that, "We are under no necessity of supposing that sacrifices were of divine institution, since in the books of Moses there is no mention made of their divine appointment; whereas the institution of circumcision, and other rites, which were of divine authority, are very particularly recorded." And, therefore, they infer, "That sacrificing, in the infancy of the world, was really a natural action."

PHIL. By the term "natural" I suppose is meant, what is congruous and agreeable to our natures: or such an employment as is proper to man.—If this be the meaning, I would observe, that, were sacrificing really "a natural action," for man to have attended to it in a state of innocency would have been most proper. Since, while he continued in that glorious state, he had undoubtedly the clearest views of what was *right* and *fit*; and consequently what was the most agreeable to the Divine Being. But, during that period, we have not, that I remember, the most distant hint of any such procedure; nor, indeed, of any thing which bears the least resemblance to it. So that, from this consideration, we may, I presume, fairly conclude, That sacrificing was *not* a natural action.

Besides; had sacrificing been a natural action, or a dictate of the law of nature, it would still have continued in force, even under

the present dispensation. For, the Christian system does not extinguish, or even extenuate, the least degree of natural light ; but, on the contrary, causes it to shine with a brighter lustre. It has greatly improved, and, if I may so speak, sublimated it. It abolishes, indeed, such things as were either *corrupt* or *ceremonial* ; but with respect to the law of nature, or the duties which were incumbent upon man in his innocent state, it makes not the least alteration. The entire abolition of sacrificing therefore, by the gospel-dispensation, evinces that the practice had not its origin from the laws of nature which are immutable and eternal, but from some positive institution of God, which may be temporary, and adapted to some particular circumstances. You will give me leave to add another argument upon this head, and then I shall close.

NEO. Certainly.

PHIL. The primary *end* for which sacrifices were appointed, is a further proof of their originating from a positive appointment of heaven.

This, according to the Jewish lawgiver, was, To avert the displeasure of God, and to free the offerer from deserved punishment, by their being accepted in his place and stead.

NEO. What evidence have you of that ?

PHIL. The best that can be had : The evidence as I have just observed of an infallible writer.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 53

writer. Moses says expressly, that the blood of the sin-offering was *brought into the tabernacle of the congregation, to RECONCILE withal* * ! In the same book we are informed, that *he (Moses) took the blood of the bullock slain for the sin-offering, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger,——and poured the blood at the bottom of the altar, and sanctified it, to make RECONCILIATION upon it* †.

Again : The Holy Ghost, by the mouth of another of his servants, informs us that, *the priests laid their hands upon the goats which were brought for a sin-offering, and slew them, and they made RECONCILIATION with their blood upon the altar* § . From which declarations the following things, I should imagine, are indisputably clear : That these sacrifices did really render the Supreme Being propitious, which he would not have been without them.——That this was effected by the blood upon the altar, without its being brought into the most holy place.——And that there was at least a typical transfer of guilt, from the offerer to the offering that he brought.

NEO. You apprehend then that there was a real substitution of the victim instead of the offender.

PHIL. I do : And the sacred code is no less explicit upon this than upon the other things

E 3

wa

* Lev. vi. 30. † Ibid viii. 15. § 2 Chron. xxix. 23, 24.

have mentioned. There we are expressly told, that, *That they were accepted for him, to make atonement for him* *. And this substitution of the sacrifice instead of the offerer was, according to the apostle's account of it in his epistle to the Hebrews, designed to be a representation of that glorious personage who, *by one offering hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified* †. So that, if those sacrifices were types of the Redeemer; if they were of a vicarious nature, and really rendered God propitious; then undoubtedly they were of Divine appointment.

NEO. Some persons, however, differ much from you with respect to their ideas of sacrificing, and think that, "Sacrifices appear to have been considered as circumstances accompanying an address to the Deity, exactly answering to the use of presents in civil life."

PHIL. Upon what basis such an assertion is built, I cannot tell. But, I am pretty well assured, that it is not founded upon any declaration in the word of God. For, if we form our judgment of the nature and design of sacrifices, from that only infallible directory, we shall find, that they were, not merely "circumstances accompanying an address to the Deity," but, in fact, a *real* address to him, accompanied with many significant ceremonies. They were the very means which God himself appointed, for the cleansing of the offerer from ceremonial uncleanness,

* Lev. i. 4.

† Heb. x. 14.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 55

uncleanness, and for leading him to Jesus, the great offering, for the free pardon of his moral transgressions.

A small degree of attention to a few passages in the epistle to the Hebrews, will, I should imagine, be entirely sufficient to confirm the preceding observations, and fully satisfy the mind as to the leading design of sacrificing.

NEO. Be so kind as enumerate them.

PHIL. In the above-mentioned letter, which is an infallible key to the Levitical ceremonies, and a faultless model of allegorical exposition, we are informed that, *The blood of bulls, and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctified to THE PURIFYING OF THE FLESH* *; but, *that they could not make him who did the service perfect, as PERTAINING TO THE CONSCIENCE* †. And the sacred writer assigns a sufficient reason for it: *For, says he, the law, having a SHADOW of good things to come, and not the very IMAGE of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? Doubtless; because that the worshippers once purged, should have had no more conscience of sins* ‡. Nay, he declares that, it is not POSSIBLE that the blood of bulls and of goats, should take away sins §. Wherefore, he adds, when He (the Redeemer), cometh into the world, he saith, *Sacrifice and offering thou*

* Hib. ix. 13.

† 1b. ix. 9.

‡ 1b. x. 2.

§ Heb. x. 4.

thou wouldest not, but A BODY hast thou prepared me.*

Upon the whole then, these declarations, I think, clearly evince, That cleansing even from ceremonial pollution could not be obtained any other way, than, as we have already observed, by the offering of those very sacrifices which God himself had appointed. And that as to moral guilt, *it* could be removed only by the Great Sacrifice, the Lord Jesus Christ; of which the sacrificial animals were lively types.

NEO. But I have been informed that, “A type means an *intended prefiguration* of some future person or event”; and that “the apostle, in the epistle to which you have referred, never once intimates, that the one dispensation was a type of the other.” And it is asked, “Where is it said that Levitical sacrifices were intended prefigurations of the christian scheme, or of the death of its Founder?” Whether was this event prefigured by *propitiatory*, or *eucharistical* sacrifices?”

PHIL. That “a similarity of circumstances will not constitute a type, where the *intention* to prefigure is not expressly declared,” or may be fairly inferred, I readily allow. But, that the apostle, in the epistle to the Hebrews, “never once intimates, that the one dispensation was a type of the other,” I can by no means grant; because it is expressly contrary to plain

* Heb. x. 5.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 57

plain matter of fact. For, if words can have any determinate ideas affixed to them, the apostle not only intimates, but expressly and repeatedly asserts it.

NEO. Does he? You will favour me with a recital of the passages.

PHIL. Ay, surely; *There was, he says, a tabernacle made—which is called the holy* *. *And after the second vail, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all* †: He further informs us that, *The priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God: But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people. The Holy Ghost by THIS SIGNIFYING, or designing it to be a figurative representation, that the way into the holiest of all, was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: Which was A FIGURE FOR THE TIME THEN PRESENT* §; that is, throughout the whole of that imperfect, and darker dispensation.

Now, that Jesus was the great antitype of all these figures, is, I think, demonstrably evident, from the following verses. *Christ being come an*
high

* Heb. ix. 2. margin. † Ib. x. 3. *αγία αγίων* the holy of holies. Here the Divine Being manifested his special presence. Here he met with his people and communed with them, by the intervention of the high priest, and therefore it was a type or figure of the heaven of heavens; the high and holy place where Jehovah himself is said to dwell. See ver. 24
§ Ib. ix. 6—10.

high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.*

From which admirable representation of things, the inspired writer makes the following deduction. *If the blood of bulls, and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctify to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the Living God†.* So that the apostle, you see, considered the Mosaic ritual as a *figurative* representation, and has clearly pointed out the Lord Jesus Christ as the grand Antitype of the whole.

NEO. Those assertions of the apostle are, indeed, clear and strong; and, I think, evidently prove the point in hand. According to this view of the Levitical dispensation, it appears every way worthy of God, and evinces that the way of salvation, which the gospel points out, namely, the undertaking of *the Son of the Blessed*, was exhibited to the seed of Abraham.

PHIL. Yes; and therefore we are told, in the above mentioned epistle, *That unto them was the gospel preached as well as unto us; but the word*
preached

* Heb. ix. 11. 12. † Ib. ix. 13, 14.

* He

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 59

preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it *. And though there was a vail upon that dispensation, so that the children of Israel could not STEDFASTLY look to the end of it †; yet there were many among them, who, with David, saw the glory of God in the sanctuary §, and were eagerly expecting the salvation of Israel to come out of Zion ‡

I will only add another observation upon this part of the argument, which is this: The sacred writer peremptorily asserts that, *The law had A SHADOW of good things to come* ||. It was a sort of delineation, or imperfect sketch of Christ and the blessings of the everlasting gospel. And, therefore, he tells us elsewhere, that the *holy-days, the new-moons, and the sabbath-days*, were a SHADOW of things to come; but the BODY, which that shadow delineated, is the Lord Jesus Christ **. So that, from these considerations, the typical nature of the ceremonial law is, I should think, indisputably proved. And, if it be admitted, that these sacrifices were types of the sacrifice of Christ; if it has also been proved, that the former were of a propitiatory nature, and contained in them the substitution of the offering for the offender, in case of ceremonial pollution; then the latter was also a propitiary sacrifice, and contained in it a substitution of the death of Christ, for the death of the offender, in case of moral guilt.

NEO.

* Heb. iv. 2.

† 2 Cor. iii. 13.

§ Psal. lxxiii. 2.

‡ Ib. liii. 6.

|| Heb. x. 1.

** Col. ii. 16, 17.

60 SACRIFICES TYPICAL Dial. XII.

NEO. Was the death of Christ prefigured by
 “*eucharistical or propitiatory sacrifices?*”

PHIL. By both.

NEO. Be so kind as give an instance or two,
 wherein the intention to prefigure is clear and
 obvious.

PHIL. That I will do with the greatest plea-
 sure. And one immediately occurs to my mind,
 which is quite pertinent to our present purpose;
 I mean the Paschal Lamb.

That this Lamb was of a sacrificial nature,
 is, I should think, entirely indisputable; since
 it is expressly called *a sacrifice* by God himself.
*Thou shalt not, says he, offer the blood of my SACRI-
 FICE with leaven, neither shall the SACRIFICE OF
 THE FEAST OF THE PASSOVER be left unto the
 morning* *. Indeed, this is the name by which
 it was generally known: *When your children,
 says Moses to the people, shall say unto you, What
 mean you by this service? That ye shall say, It is
 THE SACRIFICE OF THE LORD'S PASSOVER* ‡.
 And that it was of an *eucharistic* nature is, I
 apprehend, equally clear; from the primary
 design of its institution. For, it was, we are
 assured, to be kept *A FEAST to the Lord, through-
 out their generations* †. It was to be eaten by
 the whole congregation, as a solemn act of re-
 joicing, for their remarkable deliverance from a
 very tyrannical and oppressive yoke.

Now,

* Exod. xxxiv, xxv. ‡ Ex. xii, xxvi, xxvii. † Ib. xii, xiv.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 61

Now, that the paschal lamb was intentionally figurative of Christ, as a sacrifice for sin, is plainly asserted by an unerring pen. Paul in his letter to the church at Corinth, among many other important things, by a most beautiful transition, introduces these remarkable words : *Christ our passover* IS SACRIFICED FOR US.

The evidence contained in this passage, of the sacrificial death of the Redeemer, appears to me so clear, that, to evade it, will, I think, be impossible ; notwithstanding that the greatest subtilty of wit, and the utmost violence of criticism, may be exerted for that purpose. So that this was one of the offerings which was designed to be an intended prefiguration of the Lord Jesus Christ.

NEO. That indeed appears very obvious ; and I think that I can discern the resemblance in many striking instances. But, can you point out another, of a propitiatory nature, so directly to the purpose, as this already mentioned ?

PHIL. Yes ; and, if possible, more striking than it. The sacrifice which I now allude to, is the sin offering on the great and anniversary day of atonement. A particular account of which is transmitted to us by the sacred historian, the substance of which is as follows.

The high-priest was to take *two kids of the goats*, both which constituted one *sin-offering* *.

VOL. II.

F

These

* Lev. xvi. 5.

These goats were to be *presented before the Lord, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.* The priest was then to *cast lots upon them, one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scape-goat.* The goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, was to be offered for a sin-offering. But the goat upon which the lot fell to be the scape-goat, was to be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him, and then to be let go for a scape-goat into the wilderness.

We are informed further, that Aaron was to kill the goat of the sin-offering, to make atonement for the people—to bring his blood within the veil—and to sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat. He was, likewise, to lay both his hands upon the head of the live-goat, and to confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, upon which he was immediately to be sent away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness. And, the sacred writer adds, *the goat shall BEAR UPON HIM all their iniquities, unto a land of separation*:* and he (the man) shall let go the goat in the wilderness †.

NEO. But what evidence is there that this was intentionally figurative, or had an immediate and designed reference to the Lord Jesus Christ?

PHIL.

* Lev. xvi. 22. *Margin.* † Ibid. xvi. 7.—23.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 63

PHIL. The passage above cited is, I think, a sufficient indication of it; nay, I had almost said, that it renders it *incontestible* by any impartial person; who proportions his assent to the degree of evidence. For, in that infallible comment of the Mosaic ritual, the epistle to the Hebrews, we are told that, The Jewish high priest went into the holy of holies, ONCE EVERY YEAR; that is, on the great day of atonement, *not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people.* The Holy Ghost by THIS SIGNIFYING, *that the way into the holiest of all, that is, into heaven itself, was not yet made manifest**, in that clear and conspicuous manner, it was afterwards, when a *new and living way was consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, Christ's flesh†.*

Correspondent to this, *the High Priest of our profession has, not by the blood of goats and calves, but by HIS OWN BLOOD, ENTERED IN ONCE into the holy place, even into heaven itself; having, previous to his entering there, obtained full, complete, yea eternal redemption for us||.*

NEO. I wish you would point out to me, what the things were respecting our Lord, of which the circumstances of the sin-offering were intentionally figurative?

PHIL. Some of the leading truths of the Christian religion, I apprehend, are exhibited

F 2

in

* Heb. ix. 7, 8. † Ib. x. 20. || Ib. ix. 12.

in this type.—As the real imputation of sin to Christ—His sufferings and death to expiate, or make atonement for it—And his prevalent intercession at the Father's right hand.

NEO. Do you think each of those is clearly represented to us in the before-mentioned offering?

PHIL. Very clearly: For instance, Did Aaron put the sins of the children of Israel upon the head of the goat, and did the goat actually *bear* their iniquities? So Jesus, the appointed Lamb of God, *BORE our sins in his own body upon the tree**. *The Lord LAID on him the iniquity of us all†*. He *BORE away the sin of the world.‖*

Again: Did Aaron kill the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, to make atonement, because of the uncleanness of the people? In like manner, the apostle, when speaking in direct reference to the sin-offering under the law, assures us, that *Christ offered himself without spot to God§*.

NEO. But what might be prefigured by the *scape-goat*?

PHIL. The most probable and simple account, I think, is, that the two goats, considered conjointly, were designed to show the perfect expiation which Christ made, who actually bore our sins away in his death; and not only

satisfied

* 1 Pet. ii. 24.

† Isa. liii. 6.

‖ Joh. i. 29. Margin.

§ Heb. ix. 14.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 65

satisfied by the offering of himself, but demonstrated the perfection and truth of his satisfaction by his full discharge upon his resurrection from the dead; whereby we are assured that our sins, being translated from us and laid upon him, are carried away, so that there is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus. The intercession of our Redeemer is likewise plainly represented, by Aaron's carrying the blood within the vail. But this I shall for the present at least entirely omit.

NEO. But it is said, that though "atone-
ment was made by the death of an animal, yet
you must not therefore infer that it was slain in
the room of the offender. It did by no means
express or imply a *substitution*, or that the life
of the animal was taken in the room of the de-
linquent."

PHIL. Not *express* or *imply* substitution! By
no means express or imply it! Amazing!—
Is not the Divine direction as express as pos-
sible? *If any man of you bring an offering unto
the Lord—he shall put his hand upon the head of the
offering, and it shall be accepted FOR HIM, that
is, in his room and stead, to make atonement for
him**. Was not the offerer exempted from pu-
nishment in consequence of his offering being
slain? It must therefore certainly have been of-
fered in his room and stead. Shall I give you
an illustration?

F 3

NEO.

* Lev. i. 2—5.

NEO. I wish you would.

PHIL. The Lord says, *Behold, I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel, INSTEAD of all the first-born among the children of Israel; therefore the Levites shall be mine**. Now, Do not these words express or imply a substitution?

NEO. Certainly they do.

PHIL. The one case is not more clear than the other. It is as certain, from the general tenour of the Mosaic history and ritual, that the offerings were substituted in the room of the offender, as that in the above instance, the Levites were accepted for the first-born of the people. Indeed, to affirm the contrary is a gross affront to common sense; and a man may, I think, with equally as much truth, and with nearly the same degree of evidence, affirm that black is white; or that the east and west are not the two opposite points of heaven.—But, pray what is urged in support of so singular an assertion?

NEO. Why, “because, in some cases, atonement was made where no beast was slain, as in the case of a poor man, Levit. v. from whom a small quantity of flour was accepted as an atonement for his sin. Here was remission without shedding of blood.”

PHIL.

* Number iii. 12.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 67

PHIL. True. Without the shedding of blood, but not without the *substitution* of something instead of the offender. 'Perhaps, the apostle might foresee such an objection, when he made use of that guarded expression, *almost* all things were purged with blood!' The state of the argument you see is subtrilly evaded. The point to be proved was, that "the precise notion of atonement, according to the Jewish ritual, did not express or imply substitution;" and the answer is, "Here was remission without shedding of blood?" Pray read over the passage?

NEO. *If a soul sin,——he shall bring his trespass-offering unto the Lord for the sin which he hath sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats for a sin-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his sin. And if he be not able——*

PHIL. You observe, a lamb or a kid was indispensably required, except in cases of great indigence. And that the lamb or kid was to be substituted instead of the offerer. Now read on if you please.

NEO. *And if he be not able to bring a lamb, then he shall bring for his trespass which he hath committed, two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons to the Lord; one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering.——But if he be not able to bring two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons; then he that sinned,*

sinned, shall bring for his offering the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin-offering: He shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon; for it is a sin-offering. Then shall he bring it to the priest, and the priest shall take his handful of it—and burn it on the altar.—And the priest shall make an ATONEMENT for him, as touching his sin—and it shall be forgiven him.*

PHIL. Well, can any thing express substitution more clearly than what you have now read?

NEO. The words are indeed express with respect to that: atonement was made for him, as touching his sin that he had sinned; the plain meaning of which seems to be, it was accepted in his stead.

PHIL. Right: He *confessed that he had sinned*†; the bringing of his offering was declarative of his deserving punishment; and, by the gracious constitution of an all-wise God, it was slain or consumed in his place and stead.

NEO. But in the case before us there was you know no shedding of blood, no life was taken.

PHIL. Very true: But what was the reason of that? Was not such a sacrifice required?

NEO. Yes; he was to have brought a *lamb*, or a *kid of the goats*.

PHIL.

* Lev. v. 1, — 14. † Ver. 5.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 69

PHIL. Ay, and nothing, as it has been observed, could have exempted him from this, but his inability to obtain it. Nay, his indigence must have been so great, as that he could not procure even two turtle-doves, or otherwise his offering of flour would not have been dispensed with. And, after all, though he was exempted from the effusion of blood, yet he had something that was as it were equivalent to it. There was a destruction of the substance. His offering was consumed by fire; and that is much the same to inanimate things, as shedding the blood is to living creatures. This instance therefore is so far from weakening, that, I think, it rather strengthens the general law.

Besides; though this change of the flour for a kid or a lamb was allowed; because of the extreme poverty of the offender; yet that his thoughts were to be taken off from sacrificing an animal for his sin, is by no means a necessary consequence. So that, on the whole, this case does not in the least vacate the doctrine of substitution; but, on the contrary, still more confirms it.

NEO. But it is said, "Atonement was also required and made in a case where there was actually no crime at all, either moral or political, as in the case of a woman after child birth. She brought her sacrifice, and the priest made atonement for her *."

PHIL.

* Levit. xii.

PHIL. And what do you infer from that ?

NEO. Why, "that vicarious punishment entered not into the idea which the Jews had of atonement."

PHIL. Let us examine the premises a little, and see whether they will fairly bear such a conclusion to be drawn from them.—There was you say "no crime at all, either moral or political." True; but was there no *ceremonial* uncleanness? Turn to the passage, and see what the sacred historian says of it.

NEO. *If a woman have born a man-child; then she shall be unclean seven days:—And she shall continue for her purifying three and thirty days: She shall touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the sanctuary, until the days of her purifying be fulfilled.*

PHIL. The passage you see is express, in reference to her ceremonial uncleanness; or, in other words, it plainly shows that for a limited time she was wholly excluded from the privilege of drawing near to God, in the important duties of public worship. And that, until she had brought her offering according to Divine appointment, and the priest had actually made an atonement for her, she could not be admitted to the temple-service, without incurring the displeasure of God: And this displeasure was so great, as induced him to inflict even temporal

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 71

poral death *. So that, this case is not, any more than the former, the least proof of an exception to the general rule. There was as real a substitution *here*, as on any other occasion.

NEO. I have another instance to mention, which I must beg your patience to hear, and then I have done on this part of the subject.

PHIL. I am far from being weary : So long as we can talk with coolness and temper, it is a real pleasure to me to sift every subject to the bottom, and to try the full strength of the arguments made use of in the support of it.—
What is the instance you have in view ?

NEO. “ It is the affair of the Scape-goat ; over which the priest confessed the sins of the people, and the goat *bore them away to a land not inhabited*. Here you find,” it is said, “ the sins of a whole nation forgiven not only without blood, but without any sacrifice at all.”

PHIL. The sins of a whole nation forgiven *without blood ! Without any sacrifice at all !* Amazing ! I could not have thought that any person, who undertook to write upon the doctrine of sacrifices, would have paid so little attention to the sacred code. I would have you turn once more to the statutes at large, and see how the law is expressed in this particular.

NEO.

* Levit. xv. 31.

NEO. *And he (Aaron) shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel, two kids of the goats for a sin-offering. And—*

PHIL. Stop a little if you please: The two kids of the goats you observe constituted but *one* offering; two kids—for a sin offering. Both of them conjointly were necessary to attain the important purposes for which they were appointed.—Well, now read on.

NEO. *And he shall take the two goats, and present them before the Lord, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scape-goat. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, and OFFER him for a sin-offering.—Then shall he KILL the goat of the sin-offering—and he shall make an ATONEMENT—for all the congregation of Israel. And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat—I need not read any further; it is demonstrably clear that a sacrifice was offered, and atonement really made.*

PHIL. It is undeniable: And the Divine Lawgiver you see, 'contrary to his own rule in all other cases, orders the high-priest to lay his hands upon the head of the *scape-goat*, not upon the head of that devoted to death. He divides the necessary parts of a sacrifice between them both. To intimate, in the clearest manner, that neither the one nor the other *separately*,
but

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 63

but both *taken together*, were the one sacrificial oblation, appointed for this distinguished solemnity.'

So that the doctrine of *substitution*, as appears from the tenour of the Jewish law, was exceedingly well understood by that people; and, notwithstanding their gross mistakes in other things, yet it does not appear that they ever lost the idea, "that the life of the animal was taken in the room of the delinquent." The circumstances already mentioned, prove, I think, to a demonstration, that vicarious punishment did really enter into the idea which the Jews had of atonement.

NEO. *That* appears to me now with a considerable degree of evidence: And I am almost ready to imagine, that those persons who deny it are wilfully blind; that they shut their eyes against the clearest light of scripture. Surely, if this were not the case, none would say that in "the affair of the *scape-goat*, the sins of a whole nation were forgiven not only without blood, but without any sacrifice at all!"

PHIL. Let us judge no one, lest we also be judged. But since the scripture is so express, we may be confident, and boldly assert, fearless of contradiction, that the sacrifice was accepted in the stead of the offender.

On the whole: We have seen, I trust by the light of scripture, that sacrifices were of

Divine appointment ;——that they did really sanctify to the purifying of the flesh, but that they could not possibly, of themselves, deliver from moral guilt ;——that they were really substituted in the room of the offender, and intentionally figurative of the Lord Jesus Christ ;——and in a word, that whoever looked by faith, as Abel, to the end of them, namely to the great Sacrifice, did actually obtain the pardon of his moral transgressions.

Now, if this be a true representation of the case, these sacrifices belonging to the Jewish economy, are a striking proof of the real and proper sacrifice of Him, who has redeemed us to God by his own blood. And it is in this view alone, that the Levitical dispensation was worthy of God to appoint. Considered in itself it was undoubtedly mean and trifling ; but viewed as bearing a reference to the all-glorious Redeemer, it acquires a real magnificence, and conveys the most salutary and instructive lessons. It is this which, to use the words of a late pious and spiritual writer *, ‘ spreads lustre, life, and glory, through every page of’ the Mosaic ritual.

NEO. All that you have observed upon the subject of sacrifices, is sufficiently plain to me, except the assertion respecting “ the pardon of moral guilt.” This seems to require some further explanation. You will give me leave therefore to ask, What provision was there made

* Hervey.

Dial. XII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 65

made for the instruction of an offerer with respect to this? And what evidence is there, that those offerers, who eyed Christ as the end of their sacrifices, really obtained such a pardon?

PHIL. Time will not admit me at present to give you a solution to those questions, but at some future opportunity I will endeavour to discuss them, and I trust in a way satisfactory to your mind.

G 2

DIA-

DIALOGUE XIII.

NEO. **Y**OU will give me leave now to repeat the question I asked you at the close of our last conference.

PHIL. Surely.

NEO. The question you know is this : What provision was there made for the instruction of an offerer, under the former dispensations, respecting the pardon of his moral guilt ?

PHIL. It has already been observed*, that the discoveries of salvation by Christ, at first were more dark and obscure ; and that spiritual light was gradually diffused over the world, as the light of the morning, till the Sun of righteousness actually arose. However, notwithstanding this gradual process, there was sufficient provision made, for the instruction of those who lived

Dial. XIII. IN CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 67

lived even in the earliest ages of the world ; before ever either the tabernacle, or temple-worship was appointed.

NEO. Have you the first declaration relative to the Seed of the woman in view ?

PHIL. In part ; for doubtless Adam understood the import of the words, as far at least as was necessary to his own salvation ; otherwise why should God reveal them to him ? And if he understood them himself, then surely he would teach his children and posterity the same.

Besides, as he lived nine hundred and thirty years, he was contemporary with Enoch upwards of three hundred years ; and if so, then he had the opportunity of giving *personal* instruction, to a considerable number of those that descended *from his loyns*. And it is I think, very probable, that during the time of Adam's life, he had other discoveries of Christ given to him, besides that we have already mentioned. And the rather we may, I should imagine, suppose this to have been the case, since the account that we have in the sacred history of every thing respecting him, and even of the creation itself, is so very concise, that it seems like the abridgement of a history, rather than a history itself.

NEO. That indeed seems probable enough ; but is there any thing clear and express with respect to such discoveries, either to Adam or to any of his contemporaries ?

PHIL. Enoch we are told *walked with God*; which he could not have done, had he not first been graciously accepted of him, and acquainted with Christ as the only way, in which God and men can walk together. And we are further informed, by another infallible writer, that he had the spirit of prophecy; and therefore undoubtedly had particular revelations given to him. One of these is clearly expressed: *Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints* *; which prediction respects the second coming of Christ, as appears evident, from its being exactly similar to the declarations of the apostle which relate to the same thing. *The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, &c.†.* And again, *The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven—taking vengeance on them that know not God†.*

From this prediction of Enoch's then, we may fairly conclude, that he had a discovery of the way of salvation by Christ. And not only a confused and obscure one, but such a view as, to say the least of it, gave peace to his conscience, and joy to his heart. For, if he had so clear a revelation respecting our Saviour's *second* appearing, it is surely more than probable, that he was pretty well acquainted with his *first*. The thought can never be admitted, that he who instructed Enoch with respect to Christ's coming to judge the world, would leave him in ignorance

* Jude 14.

† 1. Thess. iv. 16.

‡ 2. Thess. i. 7, 8.

Dial. XIII. IN CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 69

ignorance in reference to the important affair of the *redemption* of it. Were such an idea entertained, it would seem to reflect greatly upon the character of Him, who, like a tender shepherd, *maketh his flock to lie down in green pastures, and leadeth them beside the still waters.*

There is however another circumstance contained in Enoch's prophecy, which, I think, will render the preceding observations absolutely undeniable.

NEO. Pray what is that?

PHIL. It is with respect to the *characters* of the persons; which he particularly points out to us.

NEO. Of what kind are they? I do not remember?

PHIL. As you have the bible at hand, turn to the epistle, and you will see their portrait drawn by an impartial hand.—You need only begin about the fourth verse.

NEO. *For there are certain men crept in unawares—*UNGODLY men, TURNING THE GRACE OF OUR GOD INTO LASCIVIOUSNESS, and DENYING—OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. *I will therefore—*

PHIL. You have no occasion at present to read any further: The same persons are the subjects invariably spoken of, quite down to the insertion of Enoch's prophecy. And they were

70 THE ANCIENTS INSTRUCTED Dial. XIII.

were you see *ungodly* men ; they were, as their practice too clearly evinced, *without law to God* : Though they professed that they knew him, yet in *works* they denied him. You observe further, that they were acquainted with the doctrines of grace revealed in the gospel, otherwise they could never have gained admission into those feasts of love which were attended to by the primitive saints. But then they vilely abused those precious truths. They turned them practically into lasciviousness. And no wonder, for corrupt religion and corrupt morals usually generate each other.

The notions likewise of these persons concerning JESUS CHRIST were impious and extravagant. If we may believe a very reputable historian *, ‘ though they considered Christ as the

* MOSHEIM gives a very particular account of the sect of the Gnostics ; under which general appellation, he says, are comprehended all those who, in the first ages of Christianity, corrupted the doctrines of the gospel, by a profane mixture of the tenets of the oriental philosophy with its divine truths. And after having described them in the manner Philanthropos has expressed, he adds, “ Some maintained that there was no moral difference in human actions ; and thus, confounding right with wrong, they gave a loose rein to all the passions, and asserted the innocence of following blindly all their motions, and of living by their tumultuous dictates. And as their whole religious system was destitute of any solid foundation, and depended, both for its existence and support, upon the airy suggestions of genius and fancy ;” it is no wonder they should be like *clouds without water, carried about of winds* ; “ since *uniformity* can never subsist, but upon the basis of evident and substantial truth ; and *variety* must

Dial. XIII. IN CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 71

the son of the Supreme God, sent from the habitation of the everlasting Father, for the happiness of miserable mortals ; yet they entertained unworthy ideas both of his person and offices. They denied his Deity ; and rejected his humanity. They denied, indirectly at least, ' that Christ was clothed with a *real* body, or that he suffered *really* the pains and sorrows he is said to have sustained in the sacred history.' So that, in fact, they maintained his whole existence on earth was *visionary*. And it is not at all improbable, but that they might think, that this was " the scripture idea of him ;" and might use *great swelling words* in order to establish that idea. Such are the characters of the persons whom Jude describes.

NEO. Well, but did Enoch speak of such persons as those ?

PHIL. Read the fourteenth verse of the epistle before you, and you will receive a full answer to your question.

NEO. *And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of THESE, saying—*

PHIL. Observe ; of *these*, that is, of the persons we have already described and such as they. Now read on.

NEO. must naturally introduce itself into those systems and institutions, which are formed and conducted by the sole powers of invention and fancy. See Mosheim's Eccles. hist. Cent. 1 part 2 chap. 5.

NEO. Saying, *Behold, the Lord cometh---to convince all that are ungodly---of all their hard speeches, which they have spoken against HIM.*

PHIL. Against *whom* were those hard speeches levelled ?

NEO. It should seem against the Lord Jesus Christ ; the same Lord who shall come to execute judgement...

PHIL. Certainly : Taking the words then in this point of view, I would argue thus : If Enoch so clearly described the despisers of Christ and salvation by him ; if he spoke of men as having judgement executed upon them, because of their hard and unbecoming expressions against the Saviour of the world, and the great truths respecting salvation by him ; then he must certainly have been acquainted both with that Saviour, and the nature of his salvation. Since he has in so striking a manner, described the opposition of the carnal mind against the gospel of Christ, surely he understood the *substance* at least of that gospel ; the only terms of acceptance with God, and how liable they are to be abused by an ungracious heart.

Now, if it be allowed that Enoch understood the gospel, then, as he was a prophet of the most High, and had a commission from heaven, he would certainly *preach* that gospel to his fellow-creatures. So that you see there was very good instruction, as to the right way of obtaining

Dial. XIII. IN CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 73

ing pardon and peace, even, if I may so speak, in the infancy of the world.

NEO. The argument, I own, appears with a considerable degree of evidence. The conclusions respecting Enoch's understanding the gospel, and also concerning his preaching that gospel, seem extremely just and natural. And to hear that such a sufficiency of provision was made, in those early ages of the world, for the instruction of my fellow-sinners, gives me, I assure you, no inconsiderable degree of pleasure. You will now be so kind as pass on, to what you may have further in view, upon this interesting and instructive subject.

PHIL. We come then to Noah, who we are told by the sacred historian of those times, *was a just man; and perfect, or upright, in his generations* *. I shall not stay to consider either the import of his name †, or the reason assigned by his pious parents for giving it to him ‡; but proceed to what I apprehend is of greater importance respecting him, namely, that he was *a preacher of righteousness* ||. Now, what righteousness think you was it that Noah preached?

NEO.

* Gen. vi. 9. † The name is נח (Ne) which signifies to rest, or cease from motion. ‡ The reason assigned is, *This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed.* Gen. v. 29. Whence it should seem that Lamech had some indication, that his son should be an extraordinary person, and be a special mean in the hand of God, for promoting their spiritual comfort. || 2 Pet. ii. 5.

NEO. As the word in the text you have quoted is unlimited, I should suppose it might be taken in an extensive sense, and include righteousness of every kind, both human and Divine.

PHIL. Right : We may very naturally suppose that he would preach the righteousness of God, or the justness of his procedure, in condemning, and *bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly* *. He would doubtless insist also upon the necessity of righteous actions, in reference to our fellow-creatures. But, what I apprehend would make a distinguishing figure in Noah's sermons, is *the righteousness which is of faith* † ; or that righteousness by which the believer has a declared right to eternal life, and on account of which he shall certainly be brought to the enjoyment of it.

NEO. Are there any other reasons assignable, to show that Noah preached in the manner you have now described, besides that already mentioned ? I mean the unlimited use of the word *righteousness*.

PHIL. Yes several.

NEO. Please to recite a few.

PHIL. One reason may be drawn from his being an heir of this righteousness himself, and his

* 2 Pet. ii. 5. † Rom. x. 6.

his building an ark as the figure of it.—You remember the passage doubtless to which I allude?

NEO. I suppose you allude to that where the apostle tells us, *By faith Noah being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith**.

PHIL. I do; and I think it a full proof of our doctrine. For, by the phrase, *the righteousness which is by faith*, we are certainly to understand, what the apostle elsewhere calls, *the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all that believe* †; and on account of which they are justified from all things. And when the sacred writer says, Noah was an heir of the righteousness which is by faith, I should imagine his meaning to be, He actually inherited those invaluable blessings which come by righteousness; just as a son, by being his father's heir, legally inherits the possessions and honours of his father.

Now, if Noah was so highly favoured of God himself; if he was an heir of the righteousness of Christ, and really inherited the invaluable privileges connected with it; then surely 'it is quite inconsistent with the piety of the man, and the zeal with which he was animated for

VOL. II. H the

* Heb. xi. 7. † Rom. iii. 22.

the glory of God, to suppose he would conceal it from the unrighteous world.'—This then is one reason to prove that Noah preached the gospel ; another is at your service.

NEO. I shall be exceedingly glad to hear it ; only you intimated that “ the ark which Noah built was a type of the Lord Jesus Christ,” or of that salvation which is in him : But what authority have you to speak of the ark as being an intended prefiguration ? Or of Noah’s building it as an evidence of his exercising faith in Christ ?

PHIL. My authority is sacred : The apostle Peter tells us, that in the *ark—few, that is eight souls, were saved by water.* The *LIKE FIGURE where unto*, he adds, even *baptism, doth also now save us—by the resurrection of Jesus Christ**. Whence you see, that as baptism is a figurative ordinance, and points out the death and resurrection of Christ, and our death and resurrection with him ; so the ark was a figure too ; not of baptism I conceive, as some have thought ; for one ordinance was never designed to be a type of another, but of Christ, and of that *salvation which is in him with eternal glory.*

NEO. So then you think, that as Noah and his family were saved in the ark, from the deluge of water, brought in upon the world of the ungodly ; in like manner, all who are in
Christ

* 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21.

Dial. XIII. IN CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 87

Christ, by a living faith, shall be saved from the deluge of the Divine wrath; and that the ark was designedly a figure of this.

PHIL. That is my sentiment; and the rather I am inclined to believe so, because according to the passage already mentioned, Noah, by building the ark, *became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.* He saw by faith, in that figure, the provision made in Christ for the salvation of guilty sinners, from the threatening storms of the Divine displeasure. And this shews clearly that Noah, in building the ark, exercised faith in that glorious object, who is *God's salvation to the ends of the earth.* Let us now return to the *preaching* of Noah.

NEO. Do: And give me another reason, as a proof of his preaching the righteousness of faith.

PHIL. *Christ, we are assured, once suffered for sins—being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; that is, as I understand it, by the power of the Holy Ghost. By which also, adds the sacred writer, he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which some time were disobedient, whence once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.**

NEO. I am glad you have mentioned that passage; for I have long wished to hear an explanation of it.

H 2

PHIL.

* 1 Pet. iii. 18—21.

PHIL. The obvious meaning of it, I think, is, that our Lord, by his Spirit in Noah, preached to the world of the ungodly, while the ark was a preparing, that is, during the succession of a hundred and twenty years. And these persons he calls *spirits*, in relation to the state in which they *now* are, and not with respect to the state in which they were at the time Noah preached to them. And they are called spirits *in prison*, because they then were, and had long been, on account of their obstinacy and disobedience, where *the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched*.

Now, if it was the Spirit of Christ who strove with the old world, in the ministry of Noah, as the above text seems clearly to evince; then doubtless that faithful preacher would deliver precisely the same doctrine, which all his successors in the ministry, who have been actuated by the same Spirit, have uniformly done. And it is certain that his successors, in whom the Spirit of Christ dwelt, *testified both of the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow**; they testified of the righteousness of Christ, which is therefore declared to have been *witnessed to, both by the law and the prophets*†. In a word, Noah, being actuated by the Spirit of Christ, would certainly preach the very same doctrine that Christ himself, and his apostles did; namely, repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. And the disobedience

* 1 Pet. i. 11. † Rom. iii. 21.

DIAL. XIII. IN CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 89

obedience of the old world to the Divine declaration, was, I apprehend, the chief cause of their final perdition.

NEO. I am fully satisfied as to the subject of Noah's preaching. It appears to me sufficiently evident, that he pointed out, to all within the reach of his ministry, the scriptural way of salvation; or preached Christ as the only Deliverer from sin and wrath.

PHIL. We will proceed then now to the times of Abraham, the *father* of believers, and the *friend* of God. The Divine Being you know called him from the practice of the most shameless idolatry, and favoured him with many glorious and important discoveries. Among other things he declared, *In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed**. That is, as it is afterwards explained, *in thy seed †*; which seed the apostle assures us is Christ. *He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is CHRIST ‡*.

NEO. You apprehend then, that the promise you have mentioned was a discovery of Christ as the seed of Abraham.

PHIL. The scripture you see renders it indisputable. Indeed the apostle, in his assertions respecting it, seems more particular and peremptory than usual. *The scripture, he says,*

H 3

or

* Gen. xii. 3.

† Ibid xxii. 18.

‡ Gal. iii. 16

or the Spirit of Christ who indited the scripture, *foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed**. So that we have demonstrative evidence, that Abraham had the gospel preached to him as well as we, and consequently he was instructed as to the real design or end of sacrificing.

We will just observe what is affirmed by the apostle relative to the posterity of Abraham, and then I should imagine sufficient will have been said, as to the instruction that was afforded under the preceding dispensations.

NEO. Is there any thing of this kind clear with regard to them ?

PHIL. Very clear. The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, speaking of those very persons *whose carcases fell in the wilderness*, affirms, that *unto THEM was the gospel preached†*. But how was it preached ? By the ministry of Moses certainly ; for he, we are told, was *a prophet, whom the Lord knew face to face†* ; i. e. to whom he made partiicular discoveries of his will. And the gospel he preached was contained in all those promises which respected their being brought to the land of Canaan. These were intended to typify the promises of heaven through faith ; for they were, the apostle being judge, a preaching of the same gospel as is preached to us.

Upon

* Gal. iii. 8. † Heb. iv. 2. † Deut. xxxiv. 10.

Dial. XIII. IN CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 91

Upon the whole ; there was you see sufficient provision made, under all the former dispensations, for the instruction of an offerer respecting the pardon of his moral guilt. So far then I hope you are satisfied ?

NEO. Entirely so ; that appears to me now as *the light of the morning when the sun ariseth*—You will give me leave to ask further, What evidence is there, that those offerers, who eyed Christ as the end of their sacrifices, really *obtained* such a pardon ?

PHIL. For the proof of *that*, I must refer, in part at least, to what is affirmed of the ancient believers, in the eleventh to the Hebrews. In that truly admirable chapter, we are told that, *By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts* *. Abel, as is evident from this text, believed the Divine declaration concerning the seed of the woman, and his being *bruised and wounded* for sin, by which pardon was certainly granted him ; and as an evidence of the genuineness of his faith, he, in compliance with the command of God, offered a bloody sacrifice, as a type or figure of Christ. By this act he *obtained witness* that he was righteous ; that is, he enjoyed the evidence of his being in a state of union with Christ, and consequently having *in the Lord both*
righteousness

* Heb. xi. 4.

righteousness and strength. And this evidence, as should seem, was by some external sign; probably by fire from heaven, since *that* was the usual token of the Divine acceptance of sacrifices in after times.

This then is one striking proof, that those offerers who eyed Christ as the end of their sacrifices, obtained the pardon of moral guilt. And I would further observe, that the case of Abel will conclude the more strongly, as it is the first instance of sacrificing upon record. What was true in his case, must be true also in the case of all who worshipped God by sacrifices after his pattern.

NEO. Are there any other instances of a similar nature?

PHIL. ENOW: Enoch had this testimony *that he pleased God* *; and therefore no doubt he saw Christ through the sacrifices, and was glad. Noah likewise, after his departure out of the ark, *built an altar—and offered burnt-offerings upon the altar. And the Lord smelled a SWEET SAVOUR* †. Or a favour of rest, complacency, or acceptance §. The plain meaning of which is, *he smelled*, speaking after the manner of men, in that sacrifice, a favour of that wherein he should have a rest, and which should fully quiet or satisfy his mind; insomuch that he is said to *have SWORN that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth.* But

* Heb. xi. 5. † Gen. viii. 21. § קנין קדוה Quies, res grata, acquiescentia. Robertson's Clav. Pent. in loc.

Dial. XIII. IN CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 93

But what influence could the steam of a beast's blood, or the stench of burning fat have upon God? Could *those* engage him to make so magnificent a promise, as not to *curse the ground any more for man's sake*, when the doleful cries, and vehement supplications, of multitudes of *men* could not induce him to shut the flood-gates of heaven? Impossible!

The object God was pleased with, and on account of which he was propitious to man, was his *own beloved Son*; who was typified by those sacrificial animals, and presented to him in the faith of the offerer; and who, the apostle says, in allusion as should seem to the above text, *hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a SWEET-SMELLING SAVOUR* *. Is a man pleased with a medal which gives a striking representation of his friend, whom he loves as his own soul? Does he esteem the person who presents such a medal to him because of the affection he has for his friend? So the blessed God was, if I may use the expression, *highly delighted* with the thoughts of that perfect expiation, which should, in the fulness of time, be made by his only begotten Son. And it was because this was viewed by faith, that God manifested his regards to Noah. So that this instance, no less than the former, shews to a demonstration what we are attempting to prove.

NEO.

* Eph. v. 2.

NEO. It appears to me beyond the possibility of a doubt, that Noah offered in faith; that he had the great Sacrifice particularly in view; and that the invaluable blessing of remission was granted him.

PHIL. Did any doubt remain, the consideration of the token which God gave to Noah and his posterity, as to their future safety from the like desolation, would be sufficient entirely to remove it: I mean the *rainbow*. The language of the Supreme Being, upon this occasion is, *I do set my bow in the cloud, and—I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature.*

Now, as instruction of spiritual things was then commonly given under sensible images; and as something resembling this was seen both by Ezekiel * and John †, when they were favoured with *visions of God*, to teach them the safety of every believer; so the same all-gracious Being would surely favour Noah with the discovery, that through Christ, *the covenant of the people*, he would never be *wroth with him, nor rebuke him*. And would in effect say, as he did really afterwards, *though the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, yet my kindness shall not depart from thee, nor the covenant of my peace be removed* §.—But to return from this digression. I might, were it necessary, proceed to Abraham, and shew the particular steps of his faith,

* Ezek. i. 27—30. † Rev. iv. 3. & x. 1. § Isa. liv. 10.

Dial. XIII. IN CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 95

faith. But you know perfectly well *what the scripture saith* in reference to him.

NEO. *Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness* *.

PHIL. Very well, and you remember likewise how *David describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works* †.

NEO. Yes; it consists in having *his iniquities forgiven, and his sins covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin* ‡.

PHIL. Abraham then you see enjoyed the blessing of pardon, and that by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.—He saw Christ's *day and was glad* ||. And I think it is not improbable, that he had a particular discovery of this, when *he offered up his only begotten son*. For, we are expressly told that he *received him in a figure*; that is, received him as one from the dead, by which he saw, in the liveliest emblem, how the Lord Jesus Christ should be *delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification*. Indeed the instance of Abraham, with respect to the grand affair of justification before God, is so exceedingly clear, that none who pays the least regard to scripture-authority, can, I should imagine, have the effrontery openly to deny it.

NEO.

* Rom. iv. 3. † Verse 6. ‡ Verse 8. || Heb. xi. 17—20.

NEO. It is indeed much to the purpose, and certainly expressed with great precision.

PHIL. I would beg leave now to mention the testimony of Job. He we are told practised the Divine rite of sacrificing; *he offered burnt offerings to God continually* *. And that he considered them as relating to Christ, and enjoyed the blessings which flow from believing on him, cannot, I should suppose, be doubted by any that are in the least acquainted with his history.

NEO. What part of his book do you refer to?

PHIL. To that part of it particularly, where he says, *I know that my REDEEMER LIVETH, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me* †.

Job in these words expresses clearly what his sentiments were concerning the means of acceptance with God. It is I should think entirely needless to comment upon them. Taken in connexion with his sacrificing, they certainly evince, that he expected salvation in the very same way, as those whose cases we have already considered.

It

* Job i. 5. † Ibid xix. 25—28.

It is further observable, that this is a striking instance of the sense of good men in general, in the Patriarchal times, concerning Christ; even without any particular revealed testimonies, further than what was handed down to them by tradition from Noah.

NEO. The instance is remarkably clear; and demonstrably shews that the leading truths of Christianity were well understood, even in those ancient times.

PHIL. Ay; and if we descend to Moses and downward, we find the light of the gospel gradually advancing upon us. For, a sacred writer asserts, *that through FAITH he kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood*; and therefore no doubt he understood, that it was an intended prefiguration of the Lord Jesus Christ.

NEO. Does *that* appear from any express passage of scripture?

PHIL. He esteemed *the reproach of CHRIST greater riches than the treasures in Egypt*. So that Moses you see, had a spiritual knowledge of the Redeemer; and though he, as well as the people of Israel, was an object of derision in the land of Egypt, upon account of the sacrifices he offered, yet that did not prevent his attachment to them, for *he had respect unto the recompense of the reward*. He was willing to endure whatever difficulties he might meet with,

VOL. II. I in

in order to *obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with ETERNAL GLORY.*

NEO. To hear of those illustrious persons is peculiarly pleasing to me : Methinks I feel my affections warmed, and my mind animated, by the consideration of their invincible fortitude.

PHIL. The thought that *we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses*, should excite us to hold fast our *profession without wavering*, and to *run with patience the race that is set before us*. I might produce various other instances to shew, that the way of salvation was understood by those ancient worthies ; and that they really obtained the remission of sins, through faith in the blood of HIM, whom God then set forth in types and figures, as a propitiation for sin.

But *what shall I more say ? The time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and of Barak, and of Sampson, and of Jephtha ; of David also and Samuel, and of the prophets : Who through faith—wrought righteousness, OBTAINED PROMISES, waxed valiant in fight.*—Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance ; that they might obtain a BETTER RESURRECTION ; even a resurrection to an endless life.

Now, *these all having obtained a good report through faith*, God himself having in many instances spoken honourably of them, *received not the promise**, they did not see its full accomplishment,

* Heb. xi. 32. to the end.

plishment, the Messiah did not appear in the world as the *seed of the woman* in their time: nevertheless they saw it *afar off*, were persuaded of it, and embraced it, and therefore certainly enjoyed all those spiritual blessings, which every one partakes of, who cordially receives the Lord Jesus Christ, as he is set forth in the everlasting gospel.—I am afraid I have been rather tedious upon this part of the subject.

NEO. Not at all: So far from thinking it tedious, I could wish to dwell upon it much longer; that I might imbibe more of that noble spirit, which appears so evident in those—what shall I call them—CHRISTIAN HEROES.

PHIL. I am glad to hear that you are in some measure warmed with the subject. May it ever be our ambition, to follow those, *who through faith and patience inherit the promises!*

It is entirely needless to insist upon other instances, otherwise it might be observed, that as the people of Israel had the *gospel preached to them*, so some of them at least understood it; and as by the promises of Canaan they were led to look for a *better country, even an heavenly*, so by the sacrifices they were led to look for a *better sacrifice*, even the Son of the living God.

Having then given I hope a satisfactory answer to both your questions; having shewn that sufficient instruction was given to the Jewish officers respecting the pardon of their moral

100 THE ANCIENTS INSTRUCTED Dial. XIII.

guilt, and that many did really understand and enjoy it, we will, at our next opportunity, if you please, attend to a more direct prosecution of the subject.

NEO. With the greatest pleasure; for I assure you it considerably engages my mind. And I trust the observations that have now been made will, in my future perusal of the scriptures, serve to disclose many things to me, of which I have been hitherto entirely ignorant.

D I A-

DIALOGUE XIV.

PHIL. **W**ELL sir, what have you thought of the good old patriarchs since I saw you last?

NEO. Very honourably: They were, I think, in several respects, highly deserving of our constant imitation.

PHIL. Ay, they may indeed put us to the blush; since notwithstanding our superior advantages, we fall so far short of their magnanimity and piety.—Shall we then now proceed to the predictions of the prophets, concerning the nature and design of our Saviour's death?

NEO. Do: And the rather I shall attend to these, because Jesus himself, I remember, in his discourses, particularly referred to them. *Search the scriptures; that is, I suppose, the Old Testament prophecies: for they are they, which testify of ME*.*

I 3

PHIL.

* John v. 39.

PHIL. It is further observable, that after his resurrection, he sharply reprov'd two of his disciples, for their unreasonable incredulity with respect to the testimonies of the ancient prophets. You may remember he calls them *fools*, and upbraids them with *slowness of heart**, for their disbelief of the prophetic testimonies. *Ought not Christ, says he, to have suffered those things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses, and going through all the prophets, he expounded to them in all the scriptures, the things concerning himself*†. And after this you know, he told the eleven disciples, and them that were with them at Jerusalem §, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning him ‡.

From these frequent appeals of our Saviour to the prophets, the inference I think is undeniable, That they all, from Moses down to John the baptist, wrote or spoke of his person and sufferings.

NEO. That appears self-evident. And since our Lord himself hath referred us to the prophetic declarations; since he thought them in all reason sufficient to have convinced his disciples of the necessity of his sufferings; I shall with pleasure attend to the evidence they give.

PHIL.

* Luke xxiv. 25.

† Luke xxiv. 26, 27.

§ Verse 33.

‡ Ibid 44.

PHIL. Could it be thought to add any farther weight to the prophetic testimony, I might observe, that the apostles likewise, when under the infallible guidance of the Spirit of God, have referred us to the same invincible evidence. Peter you may remember, when opening *the door of faith* to the Gentiles, peremptorily declares, *To HIM, that is Jesus of Nazareth, give ALL the prophets witness**. And his beloved brother Paul also, though he *shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God*, yet affirms that he said *none other things than these which the PROPHETS and MOSES did say should come†*. To add all in one word, the writer of the revelation asserts, that, *The testimony of Jesus, is the SPIRIT OF PROPHECY§*.

So that both our Lord and his apostles unite, in disseminating the important doctrine, of the clearness of prophetic testimony with respect to the great Messiah.

NEO. I wish you would collect the evidence the prophets give, into one point of view, that I may the better survey the whole.

PHIL. Those illustrious persons, bore noble testimonies to the *person*, as well as to the satisfaction of Christ, as you know we have observed before†; but the satisfaction of the Redeemer solely, is what we have *now* under consideration.

NEO.

* Acts x. 43. † Acts xxvi. 23. § Rev. xix. 10. ‡ Part I. Page 16,—22, and several other places.

NEO. Ay that is the object of our present enquiry.

PHIL. It is observable then, that of all the holy men whom God successively raised up as teachers in the church, none spoke of the vicarious sufferings of our Saviour, or disclosed the nature of his death, with that clearness and precision, as David, Isaiah, and Daniel.

The former however, point him out to us in the general, as *a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief*; according to the first important declaration, that the devil *should bruise his HEEL* *; or, as I suppose the term means, his inferior nature. And I think it is more than probable, that our Lord, in his instructive exposition, began with this remarkable text: For, as his vicarious sufferings were the point to be proved, he would scarcely overlook a testimony so much in his favour. Jacob, Moses, and others, speak indeed more of his prophetic and kingly offices than of his priestly one; but when we come to David we find his sufferings most pathetically described.

NEO. You will mention a few instances of this.

PHIL. The royal prophet, who by way of excellency is called, *The anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel* †, personating

* Gen. iii. 15. † 2 Sam. xxiii. 1.

nating the Redeemer, says, in a well-known psalm, *I am a worm, and no man ; a reproach of men, and despised of the people. All they that see me, laugh me to scorn ; they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him ; let him deliver him seeing he delighted in him* *. *My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws ; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death* †. And again, *Reproach hath broken my heart, and I am full of heaviness ; and I looked for some to take pity, but there was none ; and for comforters, but I found none. They gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink* §.

How all those things were literally fulfilled in Christ, I have no occasion to inform you, because they are frequently repeated in the New Testament, and plainly applied to him.

NEO. The application of those, and some other similar passages to the Lord Jesus Christ, I remember perfectly well ; and have often found my mind forcibly struck with the thought of those pungent sorrows which he endured.

PHIL. And especially should we be affected, when we consider for *whom*, and on what *account* he suffered ; both which circumstances are clearly pointed out to us by the prophet Isaiah.

He

* Psal. xxii. 6. 9. † Ib. xxii. 15. § Ib. lxix. 20. 21.

He (the Messiah) was, says this divinely inspired writer, wounded for OUR TRANSGRESSIONS, he was bruised for OUR INIQUITIES: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath LAID ON HIM THE INIQUITY OF US ALL. He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth; yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief: When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands. He shall see of the travel of his soul, and shall be satisfied†.*

Thus clear and express is the sacred language, with respect to the vicarious sufferings of Christ. For words to be more adapted to the purpose, or sentences to be more explicit than these, is, I think, impossible. To remark upon them is needless.

NEO. They appear obvious indeed to me; and I should wonder how any person could evade the force of such decisive testimonies, did I not consider the depravity of man, which made those very sufferings necessary for his redemption; a very considerable part of which depravity I believe consists in the blindness of his heart, and in his seeking out for himself many however ingenious, yet perverse inventions. Indeed

* Is. liii. 5, 6. † Ib. liii. 9, 10.

Dial. XIV. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 107

deed the prophet speaks not as though he was *predicting* the sufferings of Christ, but rather as if he were a spectator of the tragical scene.

PHIL. And for that reason he is frequently called, and with sufficient propriety, the Evangelical prophet. We will now proceed to consider a testimony of that peculiar favourite of heaven *, the prophet Daniel.

He tells us that while he was engaged in devotional exercises, the angel Gabriel, by a special commission from heaven, made the following important discovery to him. *Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophesie, and to anoint the most Holy. Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the prince shall be seven weeks ;—and after threescore and two weeks shall MESSIAH BE CUT OFF, BUT NOT FOR HIMSELF §.*

In this prophecy, you see, the precise period of the Redeemer's sufferings is particularly pointed out to us, and the primary design of them specified with remarkable precision. He was cut off ; but for *whom* ? or for *what* ? Not for *himself* ; that would not have answered the end of his coming. But he was cut off, if we will believe

* Dan. ix. 23. § Ib. ix. 24—27.

lieve the prophet, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins. Or, as it is elsewhere expressed, for the transgression of my people was he stricken †.

NEO. This is, indeed, a striking prediction; and, I should think, demonstrably shews, that the sufferings of the Messiah were properly vicarious. Methinks I discern a force and beauty in those passages, which I never beheld before. *The testimony of Jesus is, indeed, the spirit of prophecy* *. With what pleasure could I have sitten at the feet of our Lord, when he expounded these wonderful passages to his disciples, and have heard the gracious words which proceeded from his mouth.

PHIL. You know who hath said, *Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed* §. In order therefore further to confirm your faith, I will adduce another prediction, which, in my opinion, is no less remarkable than the former ones, and equally as convincing and astonishing as they.

The passage which I have in view is this: *Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts; smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered: and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones* ‡.

NEO.

† Is. liii. 8.

* Rev. xix. 10.

§ John xx. 29.

‡ Zach. xiii. 7.

Dial. XIV. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 109

NEO. Is it clear that that prediction refers to Christ?

PHIL. Exceedingly clear; for he himself hath made the application of it.

NEO. Where? I do not recollect the passage.

PHIL. In the history of our Saviour's last sufferings, as recorded by two of the evangelists, we are told that, at the close of the supper, after he and the eleven disciples *had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives. And he said unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I WILL SMITE THE SHEPHERD AND THE SHEEP OF THE FLOCK SHALL BE SCATTERED ABROAD**. Which words, it is evident, have an immediate reference to the above-cited prophecy.

It is as clear as the sun then, that Christ is the Shepherd the prophet had in view. And if he be the Shepherd spoken of, which is surely undeniable, then that he was smitten by the sword of Divine justice is apparent; which he certainly would never have been, had he not been responsible for the transgressions of his flock. So that this prophecy is another striking, and I will add invincible proof, that the death of the Messiah was of an expiatory nature; or that he suffered *the just for the unjust*.

VOL. II.

K

Upon

* Matt. xxvi. 30, 31. Mark xiv, 26, 27.

Upon the whole ; you see from the numerous types and predictions of the Lord Jesus Christ, which are contained in Moses and the prophets, that he was plainly described as an expiatory victim ; or as one who should endure the most grievous sufferings, in the room and stead of guilty men. So that had not the Jews been blinded by the most inveterate prejudices ; had they not attended more to their own erroneous traditions than to the infallible word of God, “ they could not but have expected a suffering Messiah.”

NEO. I remember the apostle says, *Their minds were blinded* *. And that *even to this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their hearts* †. The doctrine of Christ’s substitution however, appears to me to have been clearly exhibited under the former dispensations, and I feel my mind abundantly refreshed by the view.

PHIL. *Did not our heart burn within us*, said the two disciples, *while he opened to us the scriptures* § ? Like causes are ever productive of like effects. Therefore still when the divine oracles are unfolded ; when the light of the glorious gospel of Christ shines into the heart ; joy and consolation, peace and pleasure, love and fruitfulness will certainly be produced there.

But, it is now high time that we break off our conversation upon this subject. Only let me add this one obvious reflexion : How peculiarly

* 2 Cor. iii. 14.

† Ib. iii. 15.

§ Luke xxiv. 32.

Dial. XIV. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 111

liarly thankful should we be, upon whom the Sun of righteousness has arisen, and so copiously diffused his resplendent rays! To us *the vail is done away* *. Surely *the lines are fallen to us in pleasant places, and we have a goodly heritage* †! Thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift §!

* 2 Cor. iii. 14.

† Psalm xvi. 6.

§ 2 Cor. ix. 15.

K 2

DIA.

DIALOGUE XV.

PHIL. **W**HEN the important era was arrived, or, in the language of inspiration, *when the fulness of the time was come**, that the Eternal Word should be made flesh and dwell among us, *a messenger † was sent from God §* to give the world notice of his near approach. The person I mean is *John the Baptist †*. He came *in the power and spirit of Elijah || baptizing with water ***. And we are told that he *THEREFORE came, that Christ should be made manifest to Israel ††*.

To consider the testimony then, which John bore to the Redeemer, will not be foreign to the object of our present pursuit. And, if we attend to the account given of it by the evangelists, we shall find that he not only asserted the

* Gal. iv. 4. † Mal. iv. 1. § John i. 6. † Luke vii. 28.
 || Luke i. 17. ** John i. 31. †† Ib. i. 31.

V. Dial. XV. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 113

the dignity of the person of Christ, as being one the latchet of whose shoes he was *unworthy to unloose* * ; but also that he loudly proclaimed the glorious design of his coming, namely, To take away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

You remember, I make no doubt, Neophytus, the particular, and memorable passage in the Baptist's testimony, which I have now immediately in view.

NEO. You refer, I suppose, to that part of it, where he characterizes the Lord Jesus Christ as *The Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world* §.

PHIL. Yes; and for what reason, think you, is that appellation given to Christ?

NEO. I would rather, that you answered that question yourself.

PHIL. Christ then I apprehend is called the Lamb of God, in the passage we are considering, either in reference to the Paschal lamb, or rather as I should suppose, from what is affirmed of him, in allusion to the sacrificial lambs which under the Mosaic economy were continually offered, according to Divine appointment, both morning and evening.

These lambs were of an expiatory nature. They were offered as sacrifices for sin, and they undoubtedly answered the end for which they were

K 3

designed!

* Mark i. 7, † John i. 29.

designed *. And John declares positively that Christ is to be considered in this point of light; that he is emphatically the Lamb of GOD, the Lamb of his own providing, who alone had sufficient efficacy to remove our guilt, or *bear † away* our iniquity.

Now, as the Jews were well acquainted with the nature of their daily sacrifices; as they knew that they were designed to expiate ceremonial pollution; if the Lord Jesus Christ were not to be considered in the same point of view, that is, as a sacrifice of an expiatory nature, Where is the propriety, or even the innocency, of John's testimony? The Baptist, I am afraid, would, upon any other supposition than the preceding one, prove an erroneous teacher, and be chargeable with giving us a false representation, in a case of so important and interesting a nature. So that this passage is another proof, of the vicarious nature of the death of Christ; and I think, plainly demonstrates its being a proper satisfaction for sin.

NEO. The text according to that view of it appears quite natural and easy, and throws great light upon the subject. May I often by the eye of faith, behold the Lamb of God, as having suffered in my place, and bore my sins in his own body on the tree!

PHIL.

* Num. 28. 1, 7. † Joh. 1. 29. Margin. *αἴων* Bear away, i. e. by *taking* it upon himself. And, indeed, a lamb cannot, in any other sense, possibly take away sin at all.

Dial. XV. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 115

PHIL. Having then considered the testimony of the forerunner of Christ, concerning the nature of his death, we will now proceed to investigate his own declarations, relative to the same thing. Let us therefore for a little while suppose ourselves, like Mary, sitting at the feet of Jesus, and hearing the gracious, the heart-reviving words, which so frequently and powerfully dropped from his mouth.

NEO. The idea of such a situation is peculiarly pleasing to me; and though I fall far short of the zeal and affection of the pious matron you have mentioned, I do, I hope, sincerely desire to be taught by the Great Prophet, and to lay up his words in my heart as the most invaluable treasure.

PHIL. Our Lord indeed did not, for several important reasons, choose to speak *much* concerning this subject, till after his resurrection from the dead. He told his disciples plainly, during his abode with them, that he had *many things to say to them*, but he intimates further, that they *could not bear them then* *; and therefore he deferred the publication of them to a future, and more suitable period. But the above declaration clearly evinces, that he had some further revelations to make.

There are, however, several assertions in the discourses of our Divine Master, which clearly
evidence

* John xvi. 12.

evidence the important nature and glorious design of his sufferings and death. He frequently threw out hints of this kind, but sometimes he spoke with the greatest perspicuity.

We will therefore proceed to consider, in a brief manner, a few of those important and most obvious declarations of Christ, which have an immediate reference to the point in hand. We will begin with the following one. *The Son of man, he says, came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and TO GIVE HIS LIFE A RANSOM FOR MANY**. Now, what is your idea of a ransom, Neophytus?

NEO. To ransom, according to the common usage of the word, is, I think, To redeem a person or thing from captivity by the paying of a price. For example: I remember to have read that, when Francis I, king of France, was, at the fatal battle of Pavia, taken prisoner by the emperor Charles V. he obtained his release by restoring to the conqueror the dutchy of Burgundy, with some other concessions of an inferior value, as an adequate price for so desirable a favour †.

PHIL. Your remark is perfectly right; and, in my opinion, exactly coincides with the use of the term in the sacred writings.—Moses, for instance, has enjoined that, *If an ox gore a man that*

* Matt. xx. 28. † Robertson's hist. of the emperor Charles V. 8vo, edit. vol. 2. page 357.

Dial. XV. RESPECTING SATISFACTION. 117

that he die, if there be laid on the owner of the ox a sum of money, then he shall give for the ransom of his life, whatever is laid upon him *. So that the term, you see, even in the language of inspiration, properly signifies *a price of redemption* †. Precisely in this sense, the word is used both by our Lord and his apostles, when speaking of the redemption of guilty man.

NEO. Do you think that is sufficiently clear ?

PHIL. To me it appears indisputable. For, that our Lord, while he tabernacled in our world, knew by what means our redemption should be effected, will not I suppose be denied by any. And if he perfectly knew this, then that he would use the most proper terms to represent it to others, must, I should think, be readily granted. The obvious conclusion then is this : Since the Great Prophet of his church has spoken of his death under the notion of a *ransom* ; since he has declared this was the design of his coming into the world ; and, in a word, since he has not given the least intimation that the terms which he used are to be understood metaphorically, or in any way different from their usual meaning ; we certainly must receive them in the most proper sense ; and what that is we have already observed.

Besides ;

* Exod. xxi. 28—31. † כפר expiatio, redemptionis pretium, *A ransom*. Robertson's clav. pent. in loc.

Besides ; there is another circumstance relative to the passage we are considering, which, on this occasion, should not escape our notice. Jesus, in the preceding context, had just been speaking of his sufferings and crucifixion, and that he should immediately declare, that these should be bore for the ransom of sinners, if that were not really matter of fact, is, to *me* at least absolutely incredible.

So that we are, I think, necessarily brought to this point : Either the Son of man gave himself as a ransom for many, or he did not ; if he did, then what we contend for is granted ; if he did not, How shall the wisdom and integrity of this Great Teacher be vindicated ? What can be said in defence of it ?

NEO. But some persons however affirm, that the text which you have quoted, and others of a similar nature, “ convey no idea of a price paid to redeem men from the penalties of the broken laws, but of a *moral expedient* to deliver them from subjection to, and the practice of sin.” And that “ the death of Christ is called a *ransom*, because we are delivered by the gospel from sin and misery.”

PHIL. That the death of Christ was an *expedient*, a most noble and glorious expedient, for the effecting of what you have mentioned, is certain : We strenuously maintain, and constantly rejoice in it. It was indisputably, a most

Dial. XV. RESPECTING SATISFACTION. 119

most excellent mean, which God himself *devised, that, in the language of scripture, his banished should not be expelled from him* *.

And if you, Neophytus, or any other person, chuse to call it a *moral* expedient, if by that phrase you intend to convey this idea, that the death of Christ was designed to deliver men from the *power* of sin as well as from the *guilt* of it, I say, if this be your meaning, I readily acquiesce in the sentiment. For, I firmly believe that, according to the assertion of the apostle, *the Great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ, gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works* †.

But then that the power of sin can be broken, while the guilt of it remains upon the sinner, I must beg leave absolutely to deny; since I firmly believe that the *blood of Christ* must first *purge our consciences from dead works*, before we can *serve the living God* ‡. We must therefore still insist, that the *primary* end of the death of Christ was to deliver men from their liability to punishment. Or, in the language of the apostle, to *redeem us from the curse of the law* §. And as this was effected by the payment of a price, it is for that reason and no other, called a *ransom*, as every intelligent person, one would think, might easily discern.

NEO.

* 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

† Tit. ii. 13, 14.

‡ Heb. ix. 14.

§ Gal. iii. 13.

NEO. But when Christ says, "He gave his life a ransom for many; or the apostle, that he gave himself a ransom for all;" the meaning is not "it is said," in the *room* of many, or in the *room* of all, as their substitute. No such thing. For the phrase of giving life for life could not have been understood by a disciple of Moses, or one brought up in the profession of Judaism, as our Lord's disciples were." And "that the preposition (*pro*) rendered *for*, means *on account of*. He gave himself, or died *gratia multorum*, for the benefit or good of mankind."

PHIL. We will then if you please, examine the phrase a little more particularly. Only I would first premise, what we have already sufficiently proved *, that the reason assigned against the idea of substitution, namely, "that it could not be understood by a disciple of Moses," is evidently false; since a Jewish offerer always considered his victim as being accepted to make atonement in his place and stead. And when that great Legislator declared that *eye should go for eye, foot for foot, &c.* the people undoubtedly understood it in the most proper sense; and indeed this was always required, unless the offender satisfied the injured party by some other means.

So that the assertion of our Lord, with respect to his giving his life a ransom for many, would, without any difficulty, be understood by

* Dialogue 12.

Dial. XV. RESPECTING SATISFACTION. 121

by a disciple of Moses, or one brought up in the profession of Judaism, as being in the *room* of many, or as their substitute.

NEO. It is manifest that the Jews understood the doctrine of substitution, but what evidence is there of it in the New Testament?

PHIL. If Christ gave himself a *ransom* * for many, he certainly died *in the stead*, or *in the place*, of many: This will manifestly appear, if we consider that the persons said to be ransomed were liable to death for their sin and iniquity, or, according to the strong assertion of the apostle, they *were dead* †; and the ransom was designed to redeem them from that obnoxiousness to punishment, by the payment of a price. Consequently Jesus must die, not merely for their advantage; but in their stead.

Further: That peace with God and enjoyment of the Divine favour, which man had justly forfeited by sin, is restored to the believer by Christ's obedience unto death. For, the apostle assures us, that *we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand* ‡. Now, if not only the curse be removed, but also peace be restored, and a way of access to God opened, and these solely by the

VOL. II. L suf-

* *λυτρον* "A ransom, a price paid for redeeming captives, loosing them from their bonds, and setting them at liberty. Thus used both by Demosthenes and Josephus." See Park. Lex. † 2 Cor. v. 14. ‡ Rom. v. 12.

sufferings and death of Christ, then that he suffered and died in our stead is, I should think, extremely obvious.

NEO. "But the word which we render *for*, has," it is said, "other significations, as *because of*, and so it is rendered, Luke i. 20. *Because thou hast not believed my word*. It also signifies," it is added, "*on the behalf*, or *on the account of*, as Matt. xvii. 27. *That take and give them for thee and me*, that is *on the account of*, not *instead of me and thee*."

PHIL. Very well, and what is inferred from that?

NEO. Why, that "Christ died, and gave his life a ransom, not instead of many, but *on the behalf of many*, or *for their benefit*."

PHIL. Admitting the premises, how does the conclusion follow? There is a single word wanting, which I think entirely destroys the inference. It should have been proved that the word rendered *for*, *always* signifies *because of*, &c. and then it might have been asserted without the possibility of contradiction, that it never signifies *instead of*, &c. But for want of this one circumstance, all the rest, like the walls of Jericho, falls flat to the ground. For supposing the word in a few places signify what you have said, yet it will not be denied that in many other places it has a very different signification. And we

we must insist that the preposition (*unse*) rendered *for*, when joined with suffering for another, signifies in his place and stead. For instance : When we are informed that, *FOR a good man some would even dare to die** ; the meaning undoubtedly is, In the *room* or *stead* of a good man, in order to deliver him from being subject to death. For, that one person should die for another, except it were to deliver him from dying, is not even probable ; nor can an instance of it, I believe, ever be produced.

NEO. I suppose not ; it does not seem even possible in the present state of things.

PHIL. Very true : If then the Great Shepherd *died FOR us†, FOR our sins§ ; if he was wounded FOR our transgressions, and bruised FOR our iniquities ; if he was cut off but not for himself†, but delivered up FOR us all|| ; if, in a word, he laid down his life FOR his sheep**, and gave himself a ransom FOR all++ ; that he died, was wounded, bruised, cut off, delivered up, and gave himself in the room and stead of sinners is, I should think, a self-evident proposition.*

NEO. " To whom was this price paid ? Was it paid to sin, superstition, and idolatry, to which mankind were in bondage ? Was it paid to the devil, whose captives and vassals they

L 2

* Rom. v. 7.

† Dan. ix. 26.

† 1 Thess. v. 10.

|| Rom. viii. 32.

†† Matt. xx. 28.

§ 1 Cor xv. 3.

** John x. 11.

they were reputed to have been? Or rather, was the ransom paid to God the Father against whom the offence was committed?"

PHIL. The two first interrogations, relative to the payment of the ransom, are so pregnant with absurdity, or what is considerably worse, that I think they are entirely undeserving of notice. The querist must be either a very ignorant, or a very disingenuous person; otherwise he would never have stated the case in so very unfair, and improper a manner. A price paid to sin! or to the devil! The assertion I should have imagined, is far too ridiculous to have been mentioned by any one.

Some persons, indeed, are extremely fond of putting their opponents a fool's coat upon them, and then of making them objects of ridicule. But fool's coats and sly insinuations apart!

The price Neophytus, the immense and inconceivable price was paid, not to sin and idolatry, not to the devil, but to the *law and justice* of God. The law was basely violated, and shamefully dishonoured. Justice required that the threatened penalty should be inflicted. And therefore, the apostle asserts that, *Christ hath redeemed us to God by his blood* *; and that *he hath likewise, redeemed us from the curse of the law* †. That the price was paid to God, or, which is the same thing, to his law and justice, is clear from this single consideration, That Christ redeemed

* Rev. v. 9. † Gal. iii. 13.

Dial. XV. RESPECTING SATISFACTION. 125

deemed us in the capacity of Mediator between God and men. Now, if Christ gave himself a price of redemption, as Mediator between God and men, he must necessarily give it either to God or men; for he acts as a Mediator only between these two parties. That he did not pay it to *men* needs not many words to evince; it remains therefore that he paid it to God himself.

NEO. That appears to me now sufficiently evident.

PHIL. Did the least scruple remain upon your mind, as to what we are now speaking of, the declaration of the apostle Peter would, I believe, entirely remove it. He tells us, that we were *redeemed—by the blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish, and without spot*. From which assertion, it is undeniable, that our Lord was the true, immaculate sacrifice, chosen by God to be the real sin-offering; that he was as truly offered to God, as the sacrificial lamb under the Mosaic law;—and that his blood was the very price paid for our redemption.

NEO. “If it is insisted on that a real satisfaction was made, a real price paid, will not this be a considerable drawback on the love of God the Father, whom it represents as not over-friendly to his creatures.”

PHIL. Notwithstanding the law and justice of God required that a real price should be paid, yet the requirement of that price is not, I apprehend, the least diminution to Divine love. No; it was love, the infinite and unparalleled love of God to a guilty world, which alone induced him to make such ample and glorious provision for it.

Jesus himself informs us, that *God so LOVED the world*, guilty and rebellious as it was, *that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life**. And the apostle John, treating upon the same subject, has these remarkable words : *Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins †.*

It was love which formed the glorious plan; love, boundless love executed the admirable scheme; her kind hand loosed our obligation to payment, in a personal manner, and accepted of a Surety in our stead. So that the payment of a price for our deliverance from death, is so far from being a "drawback" upon the love of God, that, on the contrary, it is represented as a striking expression of it. The ransom which Christ paid, was not designed to *make* God more loving to us than he was before, but only to open a way for the communication of it to sinners,

* John iii. 16. † 1 John iv. 10.

ners, in a perfect consistency with the demands of his law, and the rights of his justice.

NEO. How glad am I that such a ransom was given ! Given for sinners ! For sinners of the most atrocious kind ; even the *chief* of them ! Oh ! that I may be found having a real reliance upon it, and be indulged with clearer views of my interest in it !

You will now proceed in the consideration of some other testimonies of the Redeemer, relative to this important subject.

PHIL. At another time Jesus told his audience, that *except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, says he, it bringeth forth much fruit**. The meaning of which I take to be, As a corn of wheat cast into the ground, in consequence of its death, is productive of much fruit ; so I, in virtue of my sufferings, shall reap a glorious harvest of immortal souls. A harvest so extensive, that, when it shall be gathered in, it will be collected from all parts of the habitable world.

If then sinners are called to glory and happiness in consequence of the Redeemer's death ; if without this they could never have enjoyed eternal life, which, in my apprehension, is plainly the meaning of the text ; then not only the necessity, but also the *reality* of his sufferings in
our

* John xiii. 24.

our place and stead, is doubtless a just and natural deduction.

NEO. That seems obvious.

PHIL. Well, at another time our Lord told his hearers, that, *If he was lifted up, he would draw all men unto him* *. Which words the evangelist assures us, were spoken to point out the nature of his death §; and the truth which they contain, if I mistake not, is this: That in consequence of Christ hanging upon the cross, as the substitute of sinners, multitudes of all nations should be brought to believe in him.

And the event you know hath exactly coincided with the prediction. For, so amazingly great hath the power of the gospel been, that, like some excellent magnet, it hath effected the most momentous and surprising things. Sinners, of the most abandoned character, have been effectually drawn by it; drawn from the love and practice of sin, from the most keen and ardent pursuit of forbidden objects, to rejoice in God as the centre of happiness, and to walk in the ways of religion and holiness.

NEO. I can no longer doubt whether the important doctrine of satisfaction was taught by our Lord himself. It is beyond probability, it is absolutely certain.

PHIL.

* John xii. 32. § Ver. 33.

Dial. XV. RESPECTING SATISFACTION. 129

PHIL. Were a further collection of texts, drawn immediately from the discourses of our Lord, thought necessary to confirm the truth we are speaking of, it might be made without the least difficulty. But the passages which have already been produced are, in my opinion, entirely sufficient to establish the doctrine, and render it impregnable by every opposer.

I shall pass over therefore a variety of passages, which, in their most obvious sense, have a particular reference to this most glorious truth; and which consequently might be urged with the greatest propriety. For example: Jesus says, *I am the true bread; and the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give FOR THE LIFE OF THE WORLD* *. Again: *I am the good Shepherd; the good Shepherd giveth HIS LIFE FOR the Sheep* †. Once more: When he spoke of himself under the metaphor of *a way*, he has undoubtedly a particular reference to his sufferings and death, as the only way of access to God for the guilty sons of men. These and other similar passages, though peculiarly adapted to convince the understanding, I shall pass over, as it were, in entire silence.

There are however, some expressions used by our Lord upon a particular occasion, so full and explicit to the case in hand, that I must a little enlarge upon them. You will, I doubt not, easily perceive that I have a reference to the words of the institution of the Lord's supper.

N^o. 10.

* John vi. 51. † Ib. x. 11.

NEO. I apprehend that you refer to those.

PHIL. I wish you would read over the whole passage.

NEO. And as Jesus and his disciples *were eating, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat ; this is my body.*

PHIL. Luke adds, *which is given FOR you.*

NEO. *And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it ; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed FOR MANY FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS*.*

PHIL. Now, I would ask, What can be the meaning of these words, if they are not expressive of what we call the satisfaction of Christ? Is not the most obvious sense of the words evidently declarative of this? Is it not as if Jesus had said, This bread is a representation or figure of my body, which is shortly to be broken, wounded, and mangled in the most cruel manner, upon your account, and in your stead? This wine, which you now see poured into the cup, is a type or emblem of my blood, which must, in a little time, be poured out to expiate your guilt? And does he not further disclose to them, that the great end of the bread being

* Matt. xxvi. 26—29, compared with Luke xxii. 19, 20.

Dial. XV. RESPECTING SATISFACTION. 131

being broken and the blood shed, was to procure the full and final remission of their sins?

NEO. It appears so to me evidently.

PHIL. And as this explication is the most natural, so it is the most suited to a common capacity, and beautifully coincides with the former declarations of our Divine Master. Whereas, to countenance the opposite scheme, the words must either be greatly tortured, or otherwise totally expunged from the sacred canon.

NEO. The grand design of the coming of Christ into the world, and the glorious means by which that design was accomplished, are, I think, sufficient indications of the vicarious nature of his death. But the ordinance of the Lord's supper gives additional evidence to the truth; so that my faith in that important article of it, is considerably strengthened, and will, I hope, from this time remain unshaken.

PHIL. The notices which the Great Teacher of his church, during his residence in our world, gave, both of the design of his coming and the nature of his death, are, indeed, clear and express; so that were no other to be produced, the substitution of himself for guilty man would, I am persuaded, be indisputably proved. But the immediate ambassadors of the Prince of peace, both in their preaching and writing, bare, if possible, a still more explicit testimony than

than their royal Master. They, as faithful witnesses, speak upon these topics in their sermons and letters, with the greatest precision, and in the most clear and express language.

These declarations I would immediately proceed to consider, but there is another circumstance relative to the Redeemer, which I am not willing to pass over entirely unnoticed; since in my apprehension it preaches the doctrine of satisfaction in the plainest terms. The object to which I allude, and upon which I shall expatiate a little, is the behaviour of the Captain of salvation when he was, for the noble design of bringing many sons to glory, *made perfect through sufferings* *.

Give me leave then to observe, that, had not the Lord Jesus Christ really born the weight of the Divine wrath; had he not really endured the dreadful punishment which was due to our sins; to maintain the dignity, or, indeed, the propriety of his conduct either in the garden or upon the cross, is, I think, absolutely impossible. To suppose that he died only “in the glorious cause of truth and virtue; or, in order to show us an example of patiently suffering death for our religion,” and yet that he should manifest such a degree of timidity upon its near approach, as was never discoverable in thousands who suffered for his sake, gives no very high idea of the character of our Lord.

NEO.

* Heb. ii. 10.

Dial. XV. RESPECTING SATISFACTION. 133

NEO. This consideration I think quite pertinent to the case in hand, and what seems to deserve a serious attention.

PHIL. That it may have its proper effect upon the mind, let us for a few moments suppose that we are placed in the garden of Gethsemane, and about to be spectators of the tragical scene.

Behold! then, the Man of sorrows enter, accompanied by his eleven disciples. *Sit ye here*, says he, to eight of them, while I go and pray yonder. See him now advancing into a more retired part of the garden, attended only by Peter and the two sons of Zebedee. See! what fearfulness and trembling come upon him. The forest amazement, and most dreadful consternation appears in his countenance. Hark! what melting accents flow from his quivering lips. *My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death**.

Behold him now retiring into the most solitary part of the garden, without one single associate. *He treads the wine-press alone, and of the people there is none with him†*. And now see the Prince of the kings of the earth‡, the Lord of all worlds, prostrate upon the ground!

Hark! he once more exerts his plaintive voice. *My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me||*. See how the briny tears trickle
VOL. II. M down

* Matt. xxvi. 38. † If. lxiii. 3. ‡ Rev. i. 5. || Mat. xxvi. 39.

down his sacred cheeks ! What storms of perturbation now ruffle his peaceful breast ! Nay, so exceeding great is the commotion of animal nature, that *he sweats, as it were, drops of blood falling down upon the ground* *.

NEO. The view is indeed affecting, and enough to break the most stony heart.

PHIL. And what is the cause of this amazing agony ? He had not the least internal guilt to alarm or discompose his tranquil mind. No human arm is stretched out against him, nor the least degree of violence offered to his sacred person. What cause, then, What adequate cause can be assigned, why the beloved Son of God should be in so comfortless and distressing a situation ? Why those strong, those vehement cries and tears ? Ah ! my friend, the cause, the certain cause of this tragical scene is, in the scripture of truth, declared in the plainest terms. He was now *delivered up* †, to the malice of infernal powers, and the sword of Divine justice, for the ransom of the flock. It now *pleased the Lord to bruise him, he put him to grief* ‡. *He spared not his own Son, but poured out, as it were, the cup of his wrath upon him.* Being the Surety for guilty man, Christ *Seized our dreadful right ; the load sustained, And heaved the mountain from a guilty world.*

YOUNG.

NEO.

* Luke xvii. 44.

† Rom. viii. 32.

‡ If. liii. 10.

Dial. XV. RESPECTING SATISFACTION. 135

NEO. He was now suffering, I suppose, the just demerit of our sins.

PHIL. Ah, *the chastisement of our peace* was now upon him.

Viewing his behaviour according to this representation of it, to account for the distress and timidity of the Redeemer is not attended with the least degree of difficulty: It is obvious to every one. Whereas, according to the representation of Christ, and the end of his sufferings given by some persons, his deportment is, I think, wholly unaccountable. It certainly falls far short of the behaviour of many, who, fearless of death in its most terrible appearances, cheerfully suffered every kind of torture, for the word of God and the testimony of a good conscience. In a word, if the High Priest of our profession did not actually bear the wrath of God; if the cup of the Divine indignation was not poured out upon him; we might, I think, with just reason suspect, either that the cause in which he suffered was an inglorious one, or that the rewards consequent upon it were absolutely uncertain.

Upon the whole: I am inclined to think that, so long as the history of our Lord's sufferings is deemed authentic, his prayers and tears, his cries and groans will prove the doctrine of satisfaction with invincible evidence.

NEO. I have often contemplated the sufferings of Christ, and, as it were, realized them

in my mind ; but I have never, till this time, beheld them in so conspicuous and affecting a manner. My soul, too frequently barren and fruitless, is greatly comforted and refreshed with the view. Methinks that I could, like Peter when upon the holy mount, love to continue here, and indulge myself with so pleasing and instructive a sight.

I feel, I trust, the blessed effects of it upon my mind. The flame of Divine love is enkindled there. The streams of penitential sorrow begin to flow from my rocky heart, as the waters gushed from Horeb, when struck by the rod of Moses.

PHIL. The vicarious sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ, are undoubtedly, an object upon which we should frequently contemplate, and daily set, as it were, before the eyes of our mind. Such a procedure would, I am morally certain, be productive of the most beneficial consequences. But as I may, perhaps, take the opportunity of mentioning these in some future conversation, I shall at present totally omit them.

D I A.

DIALOGUE XVI.

NEO. **S**INCE I saw you last, Philanthropos, the subject of the conversation we then had, has been peculiarly refreshing to my mind. Like the two favoured disciples going to Emmaus, having had my heart warmed with the glorious things that dropped from the lips of our Saviour, I could wish that you would now, according to promise, resume the delightful theme.

PHIL. It has already been observed*, that our Lord, in his discourses to his disciples, repeatedly declared, that there many things relating to the sublimer truths of his religion, which he, for several obvious reasons, during his personal abode in our world, chose to suppress;

M 3

OF

* See Dialogue 15.

or however, not to unfold in so clear and obvious a manner, as he promised to do afterwards, by the teachings of his Spirit.—Hence he says, in one of his discourses, *When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into ALL the truth**. And again, *He shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you* §.

I would now remark further, that our Saviour, even during his life time, ‘spoke some things to his disciples privately, and, as it were, in the ear in closets, which yet he assured them should afterwards be proclaimed aloud, and commands them to proclaim upon the house-tops.’ And to me nothing is more evident, than that the doctrine of satisfaction, among others, was thus loudly proclaimed.

We will therefore now attempt, with as much brevity and perspicuity as possible, to investigate the apostolic writings; and I make not the least doubt but that we shall, by an attention to their epistles, obtain still additional evidence, with respect to our present subject of enquiry.

NEO. The evangelist Luke I remember, in his invaluable history, informs us, that the first Christian converts continued stedfastly in the A-
POSTLE’S

* John xvi. 13. *οὐκ ᾔσχευεν τὴν ἀληθείαν* into all THE truth. Not into all kinds of truth, according to our translation, but into all evangelical truth. See *A short introduction to English grammar, with critical notes*, by Robert Lowth, D. D. now Lord bishop of Oxford. Page 32, note. § John xvi. 15.

I.
b-
er-
—
ben
nto
of
vi-
me
re,
em
and
se-
nt,
ong
as
in-
ake
at-
onal
t of
in
first
A-
LE'S
THE
nsta-
ction
with,
John

Dial. XVI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 139

POSTLE'S DOCTRINE *; which I look upon as an affirmation greatly to their honour. And all believers, in every part of the world, are said to be *built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and prophets* †.

Since then we are commanded to *ask for the good old way*, and exhorted to walk therein; since we are to follow *the footsteps of the flock* who are gone before; and since the apostles were the immediate ambassadors of the Prince of peace, who disclosed many important objects to them, and were guided by the special influences of the Spirit of God; I shall give a diligent attention to their testimony.

PHIL. The epistolary part of the New Testament, I assure you, is no less copious than expressive upon the interesting subject of the satisfaction of Christ. There are almost innumerable passages in those sacred and divine letters, which are quite pertinent to our present purpose, and I think, clearly prove the point in hand. My present business therefore shall be, to select a few of the principal of these texts, which, by different figures, and in various expressions, convey the idea of vicarious punishment.

NEO. That is what I wish for.

PHIL. We will begin our collection with the noble testimony that the great apostle of the Gentiles

* Acts ii. 42.

† Eph. ii. 20.

Gentiles bears to his Master ; when he represents him in the character of a Sacrifice for sin.

What the law, he says, could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, or rather, according to the import of the original text, and as it is rendered in the margin of our bibles, by a SACRIFICE for sin, 'condemned sin in the flesh'.

Again : *Christ our passover*, he adds, *is SACRIFICED for us †. He has given himself for us, an OFFERING and a SACRIFICE to God, for a sweet-smelling savour §.*

And lest any of his readers should mistake, or not gain a proper understanding of so important and consolatory a doctrine, he is particularly careful to exhibit it in the plainest and most intelligible phrases. Hence he says, that *once in the end of the world Christ hath appeared, to put away sin BY THE SACRIFICE OF HIMSELF †. That this Man, after he had offered ONE SACRIFICE for sin, for ever sat down on the right hand of God ||. And that, By ONE OFFERING he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified**.*

NEO.

* Rom. viii. 4. *καὶ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας* By a sacrifice for sin, or a sin offering, to which the sin was imputed, and by which it was removed. So Christ was made sin ; there was a real charge of guilt fixed upon him, in consequence of which he became a sin-offering. † 1 Cor. v. 7. § Eph. v. 2. ‡ Heb. ix. 26. || Ib. x. 12. ** Verse 14.

Dial. XVI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 141

NEO. Those declarations shew clearly enough that the Lord Jesus Christ was a sacrifice ; but the question is, In what sense was he so ?

PHIL. Since the Jews were accustomed to look upon their sacrifices as *expiatory rites* ; and since this will be the view which the generality of persons, who are conversant with the Old Testament, will necessarily have of them, in consequence of their perusal of that sacred book ; if the sacrifice of Christ were not to be considered in exactly the same point of light, all the above-cited passages, with many others of a similar nature, would, in my opinion, be directly-calculated to lead us into the most gross and fatal mistakes. Did not our Lord truly expiate sin ; did he not actually bear our iniquity ; the scripture itself, in its most obvious meaning, would be like an *ignis fatuus*, and altogether unworthy of its glorious Author.

Since then the death of Christ is, by the above-cited unerring writer, so frequently represented to us under the notion of a sacrifice ; and since we have not, that I remember, the least intimation that the term is to be understood in a figurative sense, the conclusion is, I should think, obvious to every one ; namely, That it must certainly have been of a vicarious nature.

NEO. " The death of Christ," it is allowed, " is stiled a *sacrifice*," but however, " not because
it

it was truly and properly such, in the Jewish sense of sacrifices; but because it was a distinguished expression of his regard to God. Hence also other moral virtues, such as *praise*, and *thanksgiving*, *doing good*, and *communicating* are called by that name. In short, as the New Testament sacrifices are all spiritual and moral ones, that of Christ," it is affirmed, "must be so too."

PHIL. "That the death of Christ was a distinguished expression of his regard to God," we readily grant; and the rather since he himself hath declared, with respect to that amazing scene, that he submitted to it in obedience to the *will* of his *Father* *. But to infer hence, that this was the *cause*, or *reason*, why it is stiled a sacrifice, is by no means either a necessary or natural consequence.

Nor, permit me to add, is the latter part of the argument any more to the purpose than the former part of it: For, notwithstanding some moral virtues, as *praise*, and *thanksgiving*, *doing good*, and *communicating*, are, in a figurative sense, stiled *sacrifices*; yet, to conclude that *therefore* the death of Christ must be so too, is not surely a necessary deduction from these premises. Had the inspired writers said nothing *more* of the sacrifice of Christ than they have of these other sacrifices; then indeed there would have been some appearance of an argument, because the sense of the passages would
upon

* Matt. xxvi. 39.

Dial. XVI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 143

upon that supposition have been left in a great measure indeterminate. But, if the sacred scriptures have affixed different ends to this sacrifice than they have done to any other; if such things are attributed to it as cannot be affirmed of any moral virtue how excellent soever; then we must conclude, That the sacrifice of Christ was something more than merely the exercise of a moral virtue.

NEO. You will produce the proof of what you have observed.

PHIL. In order to prove that there are such ends affixed to the death of Jesus, you need only to recollect the above-cited passages from the sacred oracles. For, there we are told that, by this illustrious and acceptable sacrifice, *sin is condemned in the flesh* *, and *put away* †; *all that are sanctified are perfected for ever* ‡; and our great High Priest himself, in consequence of his sufferings, is *sitten down on the right hand of the Majesty on high* ||.

But, where are such important ends as these connected with moral virtues? Where are we informed, in the sacred writings, that “*praise and thanksgiving, doing good and communicating, will put away or condemn sin*”? Which of the inspired writers affirm, that these virtues, notwithstanding they are *well-pleasing* § and *acceptable*

* Rom. viii. 4. † Heb. ix. 26. ‡ Ib. x. 14. || Ver. 12.

§ Phil. iv. 18.

able * to God, yet either *perfect them that are sanctified*, or are the *cause* of the subject of them being *exalted to the right hand of God*? Not a single instance of this nature can, I am persuaded, ever be produced. And if it cannot, then to urge these things as similar to the death of Christ, is, in my opinion, a mere *sophism*, calculated to impose upon the weak and incautious reader. Such arguments to every thinking person, will, one would imagine, sufficiently expose and refute themselves.

So that from these observations, you perceive, I trust, that the argument for the vicarious nature of the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, taken from his being called a *sacrifice for sin*, remains unshaken; and, notwithstanding the various objections that have flamed and lightened against it, like the bush of Moses, it remains unhurt. It stands firm upon its proper basis; that is, the infallible word of God.

Indeed, if this were not the case, if after all that is said by the writers of the New Testament, concerning the sacrifice of the Son of God, it were only a *figurative* or *allusive* thing; these sacred writings would, of all others I ever saw, be absolutely the most mysterious and unintelligible.

NEO. The evidence of the truth, appears to me in a very conspicuous point of view. My mind

* Rom. xii. 1.

mind is considerably struck with the representation of it.

My SACRIFICE! My GOD! What things are these!

YOUNG.

As to your last observation, concerning the inspired writings, the author from whom I took the foregoing objection owns, that "The New Testament phraseology has a good deal misled the multitude, and perhaps others of better education; nor can they tell how to explain it but upon the hypothesis of a satisfaction made by him to the justice of God his Father." So that he seems to think none but persons of a refined understanding, and who have enjoyed the advantages of a liberal education, can, unless by accident as it were, ascertain the true meaning of the Divine word.

What are your ideas relative to this observation?

PHIL. It is, I think, a concession much in our favour; and which if properly considered will have a direct tendency to open the eyes of many. For the illustration of this let us attend a moment to the consequences of it.

"The New Testament phraseology has A GOOD DEAL misled the multitude;" that is to say, in other words, The generality of men, where the New Testament comes, are necessarily led into what the author himself calls "a

destructive principle, and which, he says, lays the axe to the root of religion and morals."

I said they are *necessarily* led into this, because, according to his assertion, "they CANNOT tell how to explain it but upon the very hypothesis" which we maintain; namely "OF A SATISFACTION MADE BY HIM TO THE JUSTICE OF GOD HIS FATHER." Now, if the multitude, or the common people in general, who have the New Testament in their hands, and perhaps others of a better education, cannot tell how to explain that invaluable book, but upon the hypothesis of *a satisfaction* made by the Lord Jesus Christ to the *justice* of God his Father; then I will not scruple to affirm, that that doctrine is an indisputable truth, and can never be overturned but by a direct denial that the scriptures are of Divine authority.

NEO. You conclude I suppose from the design of God in giving us a revelation of his will.

PHIL. Yes; for, that persons in general should be exhorted to *search the scriptures**, to *try the spirits whether they are of God*†, and commended for doing so‡; that the New Testament should be given as a perfect rule both of faith and practice, and yet written in such a manner as would necessarily lead the multitude into a most destructive error; *this* is so great a reflection

* John v. 39.

† 1 John iv. 1.

‡ Acts xvii. 11.

reflection upon the glorious Author of that invaluable book, that, if it were once admitted into the mind, would, I think, entirely destroy our regard for the sacred writings. What must we think of that book, which, though it be spoken of as being *able to make us wise unto salvation**, yet when we read it we cannot understand it in any other manner, than what is grossly erroneous, and hath a pernicious and fatal tendency upon the mind?

The plain truth is; an honest reader of the New Testament, whose mind is unbiassed by any human schemes, will, our enemies themselves being judges, in consequence of his reading those sacred pages, be naturally led into the doctrine of satisfaction by the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor "can he tell how to explain it otherwise," until some learned *disputer of this world* help him to a different comment; and even then, unless he make the scriptures a meer *farrago*, a heap of inconsistencies, he cannot get entirely quit of the notion of satisfaction which he hath already imbibed.

Upon the whole: If the doctrine of satisfaction were, as your author calls it, "*a lascivious doctrine*," which permitted the professors of it "to gratify their sensual passions, at the same time that it flattered their heavenly hopes;" if it were "a destructive principle that lays the axe to the root of religion and morals;" and,

N 2

if

* 2 Tim. iii. 15.

if no common reader can understand the bible in any other sense, then I appeal to you, Neophytus, and to every honest man, Whether the scriptures are a revelation worthy of God?

Nay, if these principles were true, the New Testament itself, so far from being a blessing to us, would, I think, be one of our greatest curses; and the inhabitants of Italy, France, and Spain, may think themselves happy in being debarred of the reading of so pernicious a book.—But I engross all the conversation.—What think you, Neophytus?

NEO. The concession of my author, I see, is important. Upon his plan the scriptures are deserving of very little regard. And that such persons should strain them to any meaning is not to be at all wondered at. But where the Bible is decried at such a rate, by any writer, how great soever his character may be for genius and learning; his literary productions upon Divine subjects, will never have much influence upon the minds of those, who form their religious sentiments from that invaluable book alone.

PHIL. One would think they would not: I hope the sentence we have now considered, will have a happy influence upon the minds of many into whose hands the book may fall. And I think it fully proves the truth of an observation made not long ago, That the partition between
those

Dial. XIV. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 149

those who deny the Deity, and I will now add the *satisfaction* of Christ, and those who reject the scriptures entirely, is extremely thin *.

Indeed, what regard can a person have for a book, which he considers as being full of obscurity and contradiction? For this reason it is that many of these learned Gentlemen are for *pruning* the scriptures, as some others are the liturgy, and lopping off superfluous branches. Some indeed are pretty moderate, a few untowardly twigs, here and there an obnoxious stubborn text shall be taken away; but others would proceed considerably further, and dismember the larger branches, they would throw away whole books, as barren and fruitless; and ere long I doubt not, some one *more stout* and daring *than his fellows*, will lay the axe to the root of the tree, and endeavour at least entirely to exterminate it, as producing fruit "destructive of religion and morals."

NEO. I shall always however be upon my guard against the man, who in the least depreciates the sacred writings.

PHIL. And with very good reason: For, you may depend upon it that such persons have error to obtrude upon us; and, lest the light of truth should discover the fallacy, and disclose the ugliness of her form, notwithstanding the elegant garb in which she often appears, they

N 3

are

are extremely solicitous to extinguish the rays of that heavenly lamp. But *he that sitteth in the heavens laugheth at them!* May we pity and pray for them!

Let us now return from this digression and resume our subject! And what seems most naturally to fall next under our consideration, is the character that Christ sustains, as the **HIGH PRIEST** of our profession.

NEO. The sacrifice and the priest have indeed a mutual relation to each other, and therefore it seems proper to connect them together.

PHIL. That they have a mutual relation to each other is very certain; 'for a priest is not properly a priest without a sacrifice, nor a sacrifice properly a sacrifice without a priest.' Our Saviour therefore united these in his own person. For, as the apostle observes, *In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and a faithful high priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people**.

NEO. You apprehend that our Lord was typified in his priestly office by Aaron and his successors.

PHIL. Yes; and hence the apostle calls him *The high priest of OUR PROFESSION*†; that is of Christianity, in opposition to the Levitical dispensation.

* Heb. iii. 17. † Ibid. iii. 1.

DIAL. XVI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 151

dispensation. And he abideth a priest for ever : He is constituted a priest, *not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life* *.

And the resemblance between the Christian and the Jewish high priests is remarkably striking in various instances. But in nothing does the similarity appear more manifest, than in the offering of sacrifices and making intercession.

NEO. Is the scripture explicit with respect to these ?

PHIL. Very explicit. *Every high priest, saith a sacred writer, is ordained to offer gifts, and sacrifices ; wherefore it is of necessity that this man, this priest of whom we have been speaking, namely our Lord ||, have somewhat also to offer §.* And should it be asked, What that was he offered ? The apostle is very particular in his answer, *he gave HIMSELF.* His human nature, as it is said to have been prepared by God, so it was truly offered to him.—But as this has already been insisted on, I forbear enlargement.

You remember doubtless what the scriptures say with regard to the intercession of Christ. However, out of numberless passages which speak of this, I shall mention one.

NEO. Which is that ?

PHIL.

* Heb. vii. 16. || Verse 14. § Heb. viii. 3.

PHIL. It is in the epistle to the Hebrews ; where the sacred writer particularly treats of this subject.——We are there told that the Jewish priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people.——But CHRIST being come an high priest of good things to come,——neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his OWN BLOOD he entered in once into the holy place, having, previous to his entering there, obtained eternal redemption for us.

NEO. How express is the scripture ! It may well be said to be *profitable for instruction*.

PHIL. Yes ; all our mistakes arise for want of paying a proper attention to the unerring word.——But to the point.

The Lord Jesus Christ, you see, was both the priest and the sacrifice ; and, I may add from sacred authority*, the altar too. Every sacrifice was sanctified by the altar†. The altar, therefore, which rendered the sacrifice of Christ so peculiarly acceptable, was his Divine Nature. This it was which rendered it so prevalent and available. From this consideration the apostle argues, in so forcible a manner, for the superior cleansing efficacy of Christ's sacrifice, to all the sacrifices of the Levitical law.

If

* Heb. xiii. 10. † Matt. xxiii. 19.

If the blood of bulls, and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctify to the purifying of the flesh; HOW MUCH MORE shall the blood of Christ, who, THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.*

Now, if the Lord Jesus Christ did not really make atonement, or satisfaction for sin, why is he represented as our great High Priest? If he did not, like the priests of Aaron's order, first offer a sacrifice for sin and then interceed for the transgressors, why is he represented to us in this character? *If perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, what further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchisedeck, and not be called after the order of Aaron †?*

The truth is, there is not the least propriety in his being called a *priest*, and an *high priest*, had he not, like the priests under the law, offered a sacrifice: And as the scripture is so very express what that sacrifice was, i. e. himself, I am fully persuaded that, so long as those phrases remain in the New Testament, the doctrine which we maintain will shine with peculiar lustre.

NEO. Was the blessed Jesus an high priest, a great high priest; hath he, by his one offering,

* Heb. ix. 13, 14. † Ib. vii. 11.

ing, for ever perfected them that are sanctified ; and doth he now plead the perfection of his sacrifice before the throne ; how transporting the joy which arises in the mind of a convinced sinner, from so pleasing a representation of that glorious personage !

My own heart, I trust, catches the sacred flame, and glows with gratitude to my God and Saviour.

PHIL. There is another expression in the sacred writings, which, as it is closely connected with the priestly office of Christ, we will, if you please, immediately consider.

NEO. By all means.

PHIL. The important affirmation to which I particularly refer, is that of the apostle, concerning himself and other believers, when he says, *Through our Lord Jesus Christ we have now received* THE ATONEMENT*.

Now the phrase *to make atonement*, both in the language of the scripture, and according to its signification among men ; signifies *to expiate guilt*. Or, which is, perhaps, more expressive, *to make reconciliation for an offence, by an adequate compensation given to the offended party*.

NEO. It is observed however, that “ atonement is only once mentioned in the New Testament, and ought to have been translated as it is

* Rom. v. 11.

Dial. XVI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 155

is in other places *reconciliation*, *per quem reconciliationem sumus assequuti*, i. e. by him we are favoured with the comfortable declaration that repentance will reinstate us in the divine favour."

PHIL. Repentance reinstate us in the Divine favour ! And this what the sacred writers mean by atonement ! Amazing ! I should have imagined that none could have thought those terms synonymous, or would ever have intimated that the one was explanative of the other. Did the sacred writer, when speaking of the happy experience of himself and other believers, in that they had *received the atonement*, mean only That they were favoured with the declaration that repentance would reinstate them in the Divine favour ? Was *this* the source of their sublime joy, or the cause of their glorious exultation ? —I leave you to judge.

Besides ; that any such declaration as you mentioned is made in the New Testament, is not in fact true. The great apostle I am sure preached a very different doctrine. *Through THIS MAN*, was his language, *is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins : And by HIM*, that is by his righteousness*, or, which conveys the same idea, *by his blood†, all that believe are justified from all things‡*. Now if repentance had any concern at all in reinstating them in the Divine favour, Why did the apostle preach so vastly

* Rom. v. 18.

† Verse 9.

‡ Acts xiii. 38, 39.

vastly different a doctrine. What could possibly have induced him to publish justification *by*, and *through* FAITH in the Lord Jesus Christ, if the mode of representation you have mentioned were right?

NEO. But you do not make repentance useless, I dare say; give me leave therefore to ask, What is its use according to your ideas of the scriptures? And I am the rather induced to ask this, because it is said that upon your scheme of satisfaction, there is "no occasion for repentance or amendment at all." Nay, it is asked whether "it be proper, we should repent, as all demerit is already cancelled by the interposition of another?"

PHIL. I do not wonder at the assertion, or at the question at all. However, they do not affect our scheme in the least. Satisfaction by no means supersedes either repentance or amendment. Repentance we know is much insisted upon in the scriptures, and therefore are far from thinking it an useless thing.

But, What is its use? you ask. An answer in part at least has been given to this question before*; but as you desire it I will now further add, That repentance as well as faith, when well defined, will appear to be necessary in the nature of things for a reception and enjoyment of the benefits of satisfaction; but have no
more

* Dialogue 10. Page 10, 19.

DIAL. XVI. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 157

more of the nature of satisfaction in *them*, then the hand that receives (to which faith *may* be compared) or the stomach that *digests* (to which repentance may be compared) have of the nature of the aliment received and digested. And yet there is a necessity that a man should *receive* and *digest* his viſuals, if they are to do him any good, though to the viſuals alone he properly aſcribes his nourishment. And I may add, the hand and stomach are also a free gift of God as well as viſuals.

The analogy this representation bears to the case in hand, and the more particular use that might be made of it in defining both the nature and office of faith and repentance is obvious. You see however that there is a proper place for each of those important things, though neither of them has any thing at all of satisfaction in its nature.

NEO. I thank you for the illustration, and hope it will be of service to me, in my future reflections upon those subjects.

PHIL. Notwithstanding then repentance be absolutely necessary to the enjoyment of the Divine favour, and to the practice of gospel holiness, yet it by no means "reinstates us" in that favour. If it did, then we might justly glory in it. But, God forbid that we *should* glory, *save in the CROSS of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

DIALOGUE XVII.

NEO. **I** Wish you would resume the subject Philanthropos where we broke off the last evening.

PHIL. Where did we leave off? I have almost forgot.

NEO. When considering the import of the word atonement; which I would beg leave to observe some persons seem to dislike, because "it is only once mentioned in the New Testament, and ought to have been translated as it is in other places RECONCILIATION."

PHIL. I should be extremely sorry to have the least altercation with any person merely about the use of words, if there were no disagreement or opposition in our ideas. For this reason, should any, when speaking of what our Saviour

Dial. XVII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 159

Saviour underwent for guilty man, choose the term *reconciliation* rather than atonement, I have not the least objection to it, since it is evidently used by the inspired writers.

Besides, as was observed the preceding evening, there is so near an affinity between the making of *atonement* and *reconciliation*, in the language of scripture, that they appear to me to convey nearly, if not precisely the same idea.

NEO. Do you think so?

PHIL. Ay, and our venerable translators thought so too, or they would never have used them synonymously as it is evident they have done.

NEO. Where?

PHIL. Out of many places that might be mentioned, I shall select only that well-known passage of Daniel. *Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people—to make RECONCILIATION for iniquity**; which doubtless means the same thing as to make *atonement* for it.

Besides, it is further observable, that under the Levitical dispensation, as we have already

O 2

shewn,

* Dan. ix. 24. The word translated *reconciliation* in this passage is כפר (Kepper) which primarily signifies to besmear, or cover; and is promiscuously rendered to atone, reconcile, &c. That is, to obliterate sin by daubing it over or covering it with expiatory blood. Robertson's Clav. Pent. No. 1707. See likewise Levit. vi. 30.—viii. 15. Ezek. xlv. 15, 17, 20. where כפר (Kepper) is translated *reconcile* or *reconciliation*.

shewn, reconciliation was made by the very same means as atonement; so that we are, I should suppose, sufficiently authorized to use them as terms exactly of the same import.—What is the point of light you have viewed the term in, Neophytus?

NEO. The light in which it has appeared to me is this: That the Supreme Being was originally the friend of man; but upon the entrance of sin into the world, the state of amity between God and the creature no longer subsisted: It became the righteous Governour of the world to manifest his displeasure against sin: As man was become an enemy in his mind by wicked works, the Divine Being revealed his *wrath* against men. His justice demanded satisfaction.

I have likewise considered the Lord Jesus Christ as the great Reconciler, or as I think the apostle calls him *our Peace*; who, by his vicarious sufferings has appeased Divine justice, and actually removed that wrath which was otherwise our just desert.

PHIL. Very right: As our great High Priest in his death was a sacrifice for sin, it must certainly be designed, like all other sacrifices of the same nature, 'to appease the offended in behalf of the offender, as our common ideas of things, and the language of scripture plainly demonstrate.'

NEO.

Dial. XVII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 161

NEO. A late writer however has asserted, that "though it be expressly said, that we are reconciled to God by the death of his Son; yet it is no where said that his death reconciled God to us."

PHIL. Perhaps not in so many words : but if it be allowed that he reconciled the offended in behalf of the offender, as I have just observed, then he reconciled God to men.—In order however to throw a little light upon this, you will give me leave to mention a passage or two in holy writ, which I think pertinent to our present purpose.

NEO. Leave ! surely ; it is what I expect from you.

PHIL. *God was in Christ, the apostle says, RECONCILING the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then, he adds, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us : we pray you in Christ's stead, BE YE RECONCILED TO GOD. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin ; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*.*

Now, my friend, let this passage speak for itself. It needs not my voice to echo its language. Here is, you see, a guilty world, an angry God, one made sin for the guilty, that they

they might be made righteous in him, messengers sent in the name of the injured God, in the name of the Mediator, to pray, to intreat the offenders to be reconciled to God, assuring them that he is satisfied, that he will not impute their trespasses unto them, in a word, that enough is done to satisfy him, there wants only their consent and God and they are friends again.—Is it not evident then, that God here declares himself reconciled to sinners through the death of Jesus, and upon that foundation desires them, by his ambassadours, to be reconciled to him?

NEO. It appears so indeed.

PHIL. One would imagine no attentive reader could possibly understand it otherwise. However there are several other passages which speak the same thing, and in the plainest language too.

NEO. What passages do you refer to?

PHIL. One in the epistle to the Romans : *When we were enemies, we were RECONCILED TO GOD by the death of his Son* *. Which assertion, as well as the former, is, I conceive, to be understood of reconciliation with respect to God. For, were it to be explained as relating to men only, the force and validity of the apostle's argument would be totally destroyed. He argues
from

* Rom. v. 10.

from the greater to the less ; MUCH MORE *being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.*

The apostle's argument then stands thus : If God was reconciled to us by the death of his Son, while we were yet sinners and enemies, much more being actually brought to the enjoyment of his favour, we shall be saved by the intercession of Christ. But the former proposition the apostle takes for granted, as he had sufficiently proved it in the preceding context, and therefore he draws his conclusion from it. So that to deny the death of Christ to be effective of reconciliation with respect to God, appears to me entirely to invalidate the apostle's reasoning.—What are your thoughts of it Neophytus ?

NEO. I must think with you as to the apostle's design in it, and believe it sufficiently expressive of what it was brought to prove.

PHIL. Another passage similar to the former shall be produced, and then we will shut up this part of the argument.

It behoved the High Priest of our profession in all things to be made like unto his brethren ; that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest, in things pertaining to God, to make RECONCILIATION for the sins of the people.* The import of which passage, when compared with the preceding ones, is so extremely obvious, that, to make

* Heb. ii. 17.

make the least remark upon it, is, I should think, entirely needless.

If then the Lord Jesus Christ made *reconciliation* for sinners; if by his death the Divine wrath was averted, and a way opened for the communication of the favour of God, the consequence surely is, That he made a proper *satisfaction* for us.

NEO. What has been observed upon the term *reconciliation* will, I hope, have a tendency to enlarge my views of that amazing work, and increase my love to the great Reconciler. But I will not detain you from the further pursuit of the subject.

PHIL. To proceed then: The death of the Lord Jesus Christ you know is represented to us under the notion of a *propitiation*. *God hath set forth his Son Jesus Christ, to be A PROPITIATION, through faith in his blood**. And again: *He is the PROPITIATION for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world†*. To which the last mentioned writer adds, with emotion of soul. *Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be THE PROPITIATION for our sins§*.

NEO. I am glad that you have mentioned this, since my ideas are but dark and confused concerning it, and I could wish to hear a few remarks upon this idea of our Saviour's death.

PHIL.

* Rom, iii, 24. † 1 John ii, 2. § Ib. iv. 10.

Dial. XVII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 165

PHIL. Whatever of that nature is in my power, I shall never upon proper occasions, be unwilling to communicate. The term *propitiation*, as used in the above-mentioned texts, seems to have a particular reference to the *mercy-seat*, or *propitiary** under the law ; which, I apprehend, was a striking type of the Lord Jesus Christ.

This mercy-seat was a *covering*, or *lid*†, for the ark of the covenant ; upon and before which §, the blood of the expiatory sacrifices, on the great day of atonement, was to be sprinkled by the high priest. Here God, by the Shecinah, or symbol of his presence, dwelt ; and hence he *communed*, by the intervention of the high priest, with his chosen people †. But had not the sons of Aaron approached with the expiatory blood ||, and,

“ * *ἱλαστήριον* *A mercy-seat, or propitiary.* This word is properly an adjective, agreeing with *καθήμενα* a lid understood, which is expressed by the LXX. Ex. xxv. 17. And in that version *ἱλαστήριον* generally answers to the Heb. כַּפֹּדֶת *the cover of the ark of the covenant, the propitiatory, or mercy seat.*” Robertson's Clav. Pent. in loc. Parkhurst's Lex. on the word *ἱλαστήριον*. As, therefore, the apostle adopts the word, which the Greek translators of the Old Testament always use to denote the mercy seat, and which he himself uses when describing the same thing, in his letter to the Jews (Heb ix. 5.) that he had a reference to that, in those passages which have respect to the death of Christ and the benefits which we derive from it, under that notion, is, I should think, beyond doubt. Not, indeed, as *separate* from the sacrifices, but considering them as in conjunction the one with the other.

† Ex. xxv. 17—23. § Lev. xvi. 14. † Ex. xxv. 22.

|| Heb. ix. 7.

and, according to the command of God, sprinkled it *upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat**, no communion or fellowship would ever have been enjoyed by them, nor any spiritual blessings conferred upon them. The blood was the *reason* why God was propitious to his people, and without which no mercy would ever have been shewn to them; for without *the shedding of blood there was no remission*†.

When, therefore, the Lord Jesus Christ is declared to be *set forth for a propitiation*, no less certainly can be intended than this; That he, as our great High Priest, having entered into heaven by the efficacy of his own blood, after it had been shed for the remission of sins, hath opened a way of access for apostate creatures, whose nature he assumed, that they may *come boldly to the throne of grace, to obtain mercy, and to find grace to help in time of need*§.

NEO. You think then, “that the shedding of Christ’s blood was a circumstance without which God would not forgive sin.”

PHIL. I do; and the additional clause, *through faith in his blood*, is, I think, a clear indication that *that* is the procuring cause of mercy being shewn to the believing sinner. Or, in other words, that it is only for the sake of what Christ hath suffered, as the substitute of sinners, that God again *communes* with his creature

* Lev. xvi. 14.

† Heb. ix. 22.

§ Heb. iv. 16.

Dial. XVII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 167

ture man. And as he is the propitiation for the sins of *the whole world*, that is to say, both Jew and Gentile, so *through* faith in him, *we both*, without distinction, *have an access by one Spirit unto the Father* *.

Upon the whole: The term propitiation being applied to the High Priest of our profession, invincibly proves his vicarious sufferings; nor, I will venture to say, can the evidence of the satisfaction of Christ, arising from this argument, possibly be evaded, but by a violent and manifest perversion of the word of God.

NEO. The illustration of this term has afforded me a considerable degree of pleasure. How conspicuous doth the love of God appear, in giving his Son to be a propitiation for us! How encouraging the consideration to a guilty sinner, that the Lord Jesus hath, *by his own blood*, entered into the true holy of holies, *even into heaven itself* †, and is now sitten down *as a Priest upon his throne* §!

I have been told that "the propriety of Christ's being compared to a mercy-seat" arises from this circumstance, that "God did by him publish his will to the universe in general." But this appears to me quite beneath the sense of the texts you have quoted; nor can I see any thing "beautiful" or "significant" in it. Indeed, I should think that if "to reveal the will

* Eph. ii. 18.

† Heb. ix. 24.

§ Zech. vi. 13.

will of God" be a propitiation, then Moses or Paul was as truly a propitiation as our Lord.

PHIL. One would have imagined, that it had been impossible for any person, in the least conversant with either sacred or profane writers, to have concluded that nothing more is meant by the term *propitiation* than merely, the revealing of the will of God ! Is it not notorious that to *propitiate* is vastly different from *revealing* or *making known* a thing ?

NEO. Undoubtedly it is.

PHIL. Then why should they be represented as synonymous ? I know indeed that the man who is conscious of the weakness of his cause, is always interested in concealing it ; and he is frequently obliged to do this, by such unworthy and trifling artifices, as are incompatible with the character of a sincere enquirer after truth, and often betray the cause they were designed to serve. In this point of view I consider the preceding assertion respecting the word *propitiation*.

Indeed, the two phrases of making propitiation, and of revealing God's will, are as distant from each other, I had almost said in the bold and nervous language of an author you are well acquainted with, " as the west is from the rising sun." And if this were not the case, if propitiation at all consisted in revealing the will of God, then your observation certainly holds

DIAL. XVII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 169

holds good, that Moses or Paul, or indeed any of the prophets or apostles by whom God communicated his will to us, was as truly a propitiation as Christ.

But, passing this, let us proceed to consider some other passages relative to the subject we have in hand.

NEO. Do.

PHIL. The passages I have now in mind, are those which speak of those two important characters that our Saviour bears, the Surety and Mediator of the new and better testament. Characters which, in my opinion, are no less pertinent to our present purpose, than glorious and wonderful in themselves.

NEO. I am glad you have mentioned them; they are things I have for some time wished to converse upon.

PHIL. We read you know that *Jesus was made a SURETY of a better testament**. What is your idea of a surety?

NEO. A surety I apprehend is one who becomes responsible for another, either for the payment of his debt, or the security of his person.

PHIL. Very well; and the same idea is retained when the term is applied to Christ. It
VOL. II. P represents

* Heb. vii. 22.

represents his voluntary engagements with the Father, respecting the payment of our debt, and the security of our persons.

NEO. In *your* apprehension then, Christ is a Surety for guilty man.

PHIL. To be sure.

NEO. "Where is he stiled the *sinner's* Surety?"

PHIL. Where is he stiled so! I should suppose the text where he is called a Surety is sufficiently expressive whose Surety he is.

NEO. "He is, indeed," it is said, "stiled the *ὑποσῆμα*, or *surety of a better testament*, but that," it is thought, "conveys a very different idea."

PHIL. A very different idea from what?

NEO. From his being the *sinner's* surety: That is, he may be the surety of a *better testament*, and not be the surety of a sinner.

PHIL. Who then is he surety for? And what has he done in that character?

NEO. It is said, "the words imply a less perfect testament with a surety," and——

PHIL. Stop a little if you please: Though it should be granted that the words imply a less perfect *testament*, yet where is the proof that *that* testament had a less perfect *surety*? NEO.

Dial. XVII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION, 171

NEO. It is observed, "that Moses declared to the Jews, or stipulated, that all the temporal good things promised, should be given them, on the condition specified in the covenant; and of this his miracles gave them the most authentic assurances;" and on this account it is supposed that Moses was a surety, though "we read of no stipulation on his part to bear the punishment of their rebellion."

PHIL. And as we confessedly read of "no stipulation on his part," may we not thence conclude that he was *not* a surety of that covenant? But, admitting this for the present, what use would you make of it?

NEO. Why, "in like manner, God declared, by Jesus, that the better promises of the gospel should be fulfilled to those that complied with the conditions of it."

PHIL. So every thing I find must be reduced to *declaring*. If our Lord be a *propitiation* he declares, if a *Surety* he does the same. Language itself must be most inhumanly tortured, that some people's ideas may if possible escape with impunity.

But is what you have mentioned all that the scripture means by the term surety as applied to our Lord? Have we not proved*, that the great end of his coming into the world was to

P 2

do

* See Dial. xii. page 36—40.

do his *Father's will*? And was it not his Father's will that he should *drink the cup* of sufferings? and did he not drink it in *obedience* to his will †?

NEO. What you have observed appears to me evident enough. But notwithstanding the perspicuity of those passages, it is said, "we read of no assurance on Christ's part, that he would bear the punishment of sin, or that any such impossible thing was ever demanded of him."

PHIL. Let me beg your attention to the following passage: *When he* (the surety of the better testament) *cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: Then said I, Lo! I come to do thy will, O God.* Do not these words evidently disclose some "assurance on Christ's part," that he would do the will of God in that body which he had prepared for him?

NEO. Certainly they do.

PHIL. Very well; let us see then how the sacred writer explains himself. *Above*, he adds, *when Christ said, Sacrifice, and offering thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein,—Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.* He taketh away the FIRST, that is, sacrifice, burnt-offerings, &c. that he may establish the SECOND, that is,

† Matt. xxvi. 39.

Dial. XVII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 173

is, doing the will of God. And then it is sub-joined, *By the which will*, or by the *doing* of which will, *we are-sanctified*, i. e. delivered from the guilt of sin, and put into a state capable of serving God acceptably, *through the OFFERING of the body of Jesus Christ once for all**, or without any repetition of it. Which clause, I think, clearly unfolds the whole, and shews to a demonstration that our Saviour's giving himself for us, as an offering and a sacrifice to God, was, in part at least, the doing of that will which he came into the world to do.

This passage then discloses, not only an assurance on Christ's part that he *would* do the will of God, but the actual doing of it; and the very *way* in which he did it too, namely, by the offering of his body as a sacrifice for sin, by which *one offering*, we are further told, *he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*.—Now what think you of this, Neophytus?

NEO. It opens a scene to me that is peculiarly pleasing. It undeniably proves that it was the will of God our Lord should suffer—that he engaged to do this—and consequently that it was “demanded of him.”

PHIL. Very true; and hence his laying down his life was an act of obedience to his Father's *commandment* †. For, *though he was a Son, yet learned he obedience, by the things which he*

P 3.

suf-

* Heb. x. 5—15. † John x. 18.

suffered *. And he became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross §

In all these things then Jesus acted in the capacity of a surety: But for whom did he thus act? For God, or angels, or men, or devils, or whom?

NEO. It is exceedingly easy, from the consideration of the above-mentioned text, to answer that question. If Jesus acted as a surety when he did the will of his Father, by the offering of himself, then undoubtedly the persons who are *sanctified* by it are those for whom he engaged in that office.

PHIL. Surely: And in what situation are we to conceive of them when Christ engaged as their surety?

NEO. As sinners. *While we were yet SINNERS Christ died for us* †.

PHIL. We may then you see, boldly, with sufficient propriety, and fearless of contradiction say; That the Lord Jesus Christ is the *sinner's* surety. Indeed, were we to understand this office of our Lord in any other light, it would, I think, greatly detract from the glory of God. For, has he not given us the strongest assurances we can have, of his favourable intentions towards us? *Being willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel*

* Heb. v. 8. § Phil. ii. 8. † Rom. v. 8.

Dial. XVII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 175

counsel, has he not confirmed it with an oath? That by two such immutable things, as his Counsel expressed in his promise, and his Oath annexed to it, in which it is impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us.*

Now do God's counsel and oath think you need any thing to ratify them?

NEO. No; they are like himself, I apprehend, *without variableness or shadow of turning.*

PHIL. Certainly. For God is not a MAN that he should lie. Men, and even men of high degree too, are a lie†; they cannot be trusted, at least many of them, and therefore in our transactions with them sureties are absolutely necessary. But this is by no means the case with respect to God. *Hath he said any thing, and shall he not do it? Or hath he spoken, and will he not make it good?*

We have no need of a surety then with respect to God. His promise and oath are entirely sufficient of themselves, without any further security. And indeed what further security can be given? Supposing it were admitted that Christ was a surety with respect to God, yet if he were “*a man only* ;” and “*a man in all respects like ourselves*” too, which you know in the opinion of some persons “*is the scripture idea of him* ;” what additional assurance could

* Heb. vi. 17, 18. † Pſal. lxi. 9.

could he give us? Can the word of a *man* add any weight or authority to the word of God?

Nay, even according to *our* view of Jesus, considering him according to the scripture representation of him, as Emmanuel, God with us, yet even then we cannot, if I may venture to use the expression, we cannot have stronger assurances than God hath given.

NEO. The *promises of God*, I firmly believe, are *all* YEA and AMEN, and will assuredly have their accomplishment to all who are the *heirs* of them. And this has been, and still is, a considerable part of my joy.

PHIL. Yes, and the joy of every believer in the Lord Jesus Christ.—We must insist upon it then, that the suretyship engagements of our Saviour, are not from God to us, as though his declarations could be rendered more valid by them, but from us to God; to insure the payment of that immense debt which we had contracted, and at last to present us *perfect, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing*. And the reason why we conclude this to be the true scripture idea of the suretyship of Christ, is, because he undertook as we have shewn, to expiate our guilt, by the substitution of himself in our place and stead; and, as he himself declared, to *raise us up at the last day**. So that he in effect said to his Father, when he engaged in this arduous and important undertaking
for

Dial. XVII. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 177

for guilty man, as Paul to Philemon concerning Onesimus, *If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on my account, I will repay it.* Or as Judah said unto Israel his father, respecting his brother Benjamin, *I will be surety for him; of my hand shalt thou require him: If I bring him not unto thee, and set him before thee, then let me bear the blame for ever.*

Upon the whole: If Christ as a Surety engaged to do the will of God; if he has actually done it; and if that will was that he should offer up himself as an expiatory sacrifice once for all; then surely he made satisfaction for us.

NEO. The argument appears to me invincible. And methinks I see a peculiar beauty in this character of our blessed Lord. Did he thus engage in the behalf of us worthless insolvents; did he pay that immense debt which we had contracted, by our shameless and numberless violations of the Divine law;—and did the payment of that cost him his precious life; how wondrous the love! How matchless the grace! May my views of it be more enlarged, and my interest in it more clear to me! Then shall I indeed, like the believers of old, *rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.*

PHIL. It was from believing views of Jesus, as having engaged in our behalf, that animated the apostle, when he says, *Who shall lay any thing*
to

to the charge of God's elect? It is Christ that died, is a sufficient answer to every charge. They who by faith can plead this, or have a well-grounded hope of their interest in it, may and ought to be confident, as well as the apostle, that nothing shall separate them from the love of Christ.

I would now more fully prove that our Saviour as the surety of the better testament, actually bare both sin and the punishment of it. But as I design to consider these distinctly by themselves, as the scripture seems to do, they must at present be omitted. And indeed we must I believe break off our conversation entirely at this time; for other affairs require my attendance, and necessarily call me to bid you adieu.

D I A-

D I A L O G U E XVIII.

PHIL. **W**ELL, Neophytus, how have your thoughts been engaged since our last conversation together?

NEO. The world and the things of it, alas ! engross far too great a part of them ; but, I bless God, the stream does not run wholly that way. I have had many pleasing reflections upon our dear Redeemer, both with respect to his person and offices, and especially upon his suretyship-engagements for guilty men.

PHIL. To those who see no *form nor comeliness* in Jesus, which is the case of many, his name and offices are wholly tasteless ; but it will never be entirely so with those that love him, unless he could cease to be *precious to them that believe*.

NEO.

NEO. I think the true meaning of that expression, *his name is as ointment poured forth*, is not unknown to me, but in some measure verified by happy experience. And I assure you, Philanthropos, it is with no small pleasure that I visit you this evening, from the expectation I have, that you will point out to me, in the course of our conversation, some other beauties of our blessed Lord.

PHIL. Your expectations from *men* should never be too much enlarged; if they are you will certainly be disappointed. However, we will make the Captain of our salvation the subject of conversation, and begin if you please with his important office as MEDIATOR of the *new covenant*.

NEO. I wish you would; and I am the rather intent upon it, because I have heard of late, that glorious office of our Saviour's, as I think, greatly depreciated; and, like himself by Herod and his men of war, set at nought.

PHIL. Very probably so: There have always been persons in the world, and there are many, too many alas! even in our day, who *stumble at that stumbling stone*; and to whom Christ himself is *a rock of offence*.—You remember, I doubt not, what the scripture says of Jesus, relative to his *mediatorial* character.

NEO.

Dial. XVIII. Of CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 181

NEO. I remember in part at least very well.—
There is—*one Mediator between God and men,
the man Christ Jesus* *. And again, the same
inspired writer informs us, that *he is the Mediator
of a better covenant* †; and of *the new covenant* ‡.

PHIL. Very well : Let us see then if we can
properly ascertain the meaning of the term;
and by that means we shall see what may be
inferred from it in proof of our doctrine. Now,
a mediator you know is generally supposed to
be one who interposes between two contending
parties, in order if possible to effect a recon-
ciliation.

NEO. That, it is granted, “is the com-
monly received notion of a mediator;” but
then it “is not, some think, the *scripture* idea
of a mediator.”

PHIL. Pray, What then is it said is the
scripture idea of a mediator ?

NEO. “A mediator, in the sense of sacred
scripture, is *one between God and the people* ; who
declares to them the mind of God, denounces
judgements upon the disobedient, and pro-
claims pardon to penitent characters.” And
thus it was, it is said, that both Moses and
Christ mediated: They were “employed to
communicate” their respective revelations “to
the people.”

VOL. II.

Q

PHIL.

* 1 Tim. ii. 5.

† Heb. viii. 6.

‡ Ibid xii. 24.

PHIL. We allow that Moses was a mediator of the first covenant, tho' no surety of it: Hence the apostle, speaking of that covenant, says, *It was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator**. But then, though Moses acted as Mediator, we are not to consider him as a mere declarer; for, we are told that *he took blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words†*.

Moses going between God and the people; they being afraid if God spoke to them directly they should die: His standing in the gap and interceding after the affair of the Calf, lest they should be destroyed; and often at other times interceding for them: In all these things I apprehend his mediatorial character was available, because emblematical of Christ's mediation. The people's looking after him, when he went unto the tabernacle‡, I should suppose, suggests this idea.

Had nothing more then been said of Jesus, than simply that he was a MEDIATOR, we might, it should seem, from this instance of Moses, have fairly concluded, that something *more, and greater*, was intended by the term than merely a declaring of the will of God.

But, the scripture hath not left this important subject in so indeterminate a manner. Sufficient discoveries are made, by the inspired writers,

* Gal. iii. 19. † Exod. xxiv. 8, ‡ Ibid xxxiii. 8.

Dial. XVIII. Of CHRIST's SATISFACTION. 183

writers, of the precise manner in which our Saviour mediated between God and men. Animated by the pleasing subject, and conscious of its great importance to mankind, they tell us, *for THIS CAUSE he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that BY MEANS OF DEATH, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance* *.

Now, it is undeniably evident from this text, that Christ doth not mediate chiefly, if at all, by declaring the will of God, but by dying as the substitute of guilty man. I said, *if at all*, because the declaring of the will of God, I apprehend, belongs to him under the character of the *Messenger* of the Covenant †, rather than the Mediator of it. However it was by means of death only, that he could effectually *mediate* between God and men; and it is you see indisputably evident, from the before-cited text, that this was the very way in which he acted as Mediator. The apostles testimony in this case is so exceedingly peremptory, that there is not, I presume, even so much as a possibility of evading it.

NEO. The passage is indeed remarkably clear; and, to me at least, is quite sufficient to fix the scripture idea of the term.

PHIL. To corroborate however the evidence of so interesting a truth, the passages you mentioned,

Q 2

* Heb. ix. 15. † Mal. iii. 1.

tioned may be fairly produced. For, when Christ is affirmed to be the *MEDIATOR between God and men*, the manner how this mediation is effected, is immediately subjoined: *Who gave himself A RANSOM for all* *. So that the ransom which our Saviour gave, to the law and justice of God, was, in the apostle's judgement, the great and only mean of our reconciliation to God, and the ground of our admission to the enjoyment of his favour.

And when believers are represented as having come to *Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant*, it is directly added, *and to the BLOOD OF SPRINKLING, which speaketh better things than the blood of Abel*. Which words seem to have a particular reference, to the sprinkling of the blood of the expiatory sacrifices under the law. And as by the sprinkling of *this*, the peculiar covenant into which God entered with the Jews was confirmed, and the blessings of it conferred upon them; so, in consequence of Christ's having died as a sacrifice for sin, and entered into heaven by his own blood, the everlasting covenant of grace and peace is ratified, and the unspeakable, never-fading mercies of it insured to all the seed.

On the whole then, nothing is more clear from the current of scripture than this; That the Lord Jesus Christ sustains the glorious character of Mediator, not on account of his declaring the will of God, &c. but because *he*

gave

* 1 Tim. ii. 6.

gave himself as a proper satisfaction for our sins. Nor can those passages of the New Testament, which have been mentioned upon this occasion, possibly be construed to any other sense, without doing them the greatest and most shameless violence.

NEO. The mediation of Christ, I clearly perceive, has chiefly respect to his being a vicarious sacrifice. And this methinks, by every conscious sinner, will be thankfully received as *a faithful saying, and ever worthy of all acceptance.*

PHIL. A person who is acquainted in any tolerable degree, with the infinite holiness and inflexible justice of God, and at the same time has no view of the mediation of Christ, or of his peace-speaking blood, must, I should suppose, like the Philippian jailor, be in the most hopeless and perplexing state. But man's extremity is, generally speaking, God's opportunity; and when all other refuges fail, when the *bail* of God's displeasure hath intirely *swept* them away, Christ as having satisfied for us, is a soul-securing *covert*.

But, passing this, let us now consider the argument for satisfaction taken from the *imputation of sin* to Christ; or his being charged with guilt on our account.

NEO. Are the sacred writers express with respect to that?

Q 3

PHIL.

PHIL. Why do you ask the question ? Your own reading must have sufficiently informed you of it.

NEO. I remember to have read some particular passages of this kind, and I had almost formed the resolution, upon occasion of an assertion I lately met with, to have carefully searched the scriptures with this view.

PHIL. Pray, what assertion was it ?

NEO. Why, that “phrases of suffering *for our sins*, *bearing our sins*, suggest the idea of Christ’s innocence ;——that is was not on account of *his own sin* that he suffered, but merely through the malevolence, malice, and iniquity of others ;——In short, that he fell a victim to the licentiousness of the nation he belonged to, and the age he lived in, and not to any demerit of his own.”

PHIL. A most singular assertion indeed ! But at the same time a miserable subterfuge to evade the force of Divine testimony. One would almost be ready to imagine, that no person of common understanding could put such a construction upon the most obvious passages of scripture, unless he were in the awful predicament of those, to whom God hath sent *strong delusion*, *because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved*.—So you were about to examine how the assertion would quadrate with the scripture declarations were you ?

NEO.

NEO. I was.

PHIL. Why, one single blow with the *hammer* of the Divine word, would entirely demolish ten thousand such objections. They cannot bear to be confronted by scripture declarations. They vanish before them, like the vapours before the rising sun.

NEO. You will mention a few of the leading passages, which represent to us this important, and singular transaction.

PHIL. Ay, with pleasure :—We are at present considering *apostolic testimonies* you know, and therefore I shall confine myself entirely to them. However, it will be quite necessary, in order fully to perceive the propriety and force of the New Testament phrases respecting this, to keep in mind the transfer of guilt from the offerer to the sacrifice, under the Levitical dispensation ; and especially the affair of the scape-goat.—Besides, the *prophetic testimonies* should not be forgot, particularly those before-mentioned ones *, that *the Lord LAID ON Christ, the iniquity of us all* ; and that *he BARE the sin of many* ; for doubtless the apostles in their writings had particular reference to those ancient, striking, and well-known testimonies, which therefore will serve as a clue to the part of scripture we are now upon.

NEO.

* See Dial. XIV.

NEO. I trust I shall never lose sight of those things Philanthropos, but keep them in mind as a most valuable treasure.

PHIL. The apostle Paul, who throws considerable light upon every subject he handles, and knew well its importance to mankind, is very particular relative to what we are now considering. In his second letter to the church at Corinth, he tells them that *God MADE him*, that is, his Son, *SIN for us**. And in his epistle to the Hebrews, he asserts that *Christ was once offered TO BEAR THE SINS of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, WITHOUT SIN, unto salvation†*.

Another of the sacred penmen, having asserted that *Christ suffered for us*, adds,—*who his own self BARE OUR SINS in his own body on the tree‡*. If, then, the Lord Jesus Christ was made sin; if he was once offered to bear sin; if he bare it his own self, and in his own body; and if, in short, he will soon appear without sin; then surely we may confidently assert, That sin was charged upon him, or imputed to him. It was certainly accounted HIS.

NEO. It should seem so indeed; and I am glad that the sacred writers are so very express with respect to it. “But,” it is said, “beside the manifest injustice, and indeed absurdity, of an innocent person’s being punished for one that

* 2 Cor. v. 21.

† Heb. ix. 26.

‡ 1 Pet. ii. 24.

Dial. XVIII. Of CHRIST's SATISFACTION. 189

that is guilty, the word does not signify to bear or take upon another, but to bear away, or to remove, by whatever means: so that the texts above-mentioned correspond to 1 John iii. 5, 6. *And ye know that he was manifest to take away our sins, and in him was no sin.*"

PHIL. It seems to indicate too much of that spirit which God hates, to tax him with *injustice*, or his declarations with absurdity. But, no doubt the Majesty of heaven will sufficiently clear himself of every calumny, and *appear perfectly righteous, and entirely clear of every charge when he judgeth.*

To the latter part of the objection I would reply, That Christ was manifested to take away sins, is a glorious and important truth. A truth in which every real believer continually rejoices. But then the question naturally returns upon us, How did he take them away? The text in John's epistle is general; he took sins away by some means or other: But the other texts we have mentioned are particular. *He bore them* we are told, and not only so, but bore them in his *own body*. *These* then are not to be illustrated by *that*, but *that* by *these*. And if so, a common reader, a person of an ordinary capacity, would naturally conclude, That he *took sin upon him*, or however that it was *laid upon him*, and truly accounted *his*.

NEO. But you know it is said "the word does not signify—to take upon another." PHIL.

PHIL. Assertions, however peremptory, without proofs, are little to be regarded. Supposing for instance I should assert on the contrary, That it *does* signify to *take upon another*, and give no proof of it, Who would be under any obligation to believe me? Surely none. And if not in the one case, Why in the other?

NEO. Will you then point out a few passages where the word is used.

PHIL. Ay, surely: And it may be proper to observe, That there are two words* made use of in the Old Testament, to convey this important idea to us, both which it is evident are translated *to bear*. The one signifies to *lift* or *take up*, as the ark was *born up upon* the waters †; and is used to *bear sin* typically in a vicarious manner, as the sons of Aaron are said to BEAR the INIQUITY of the congregation §; or the scape-goat on the anniversary day of atonement ||.

The other signifies to *support*, *bear*, or *carry as a burden*. This may be exemplified by that beautiful and striking passage of the prophet Isaiah, *To hoary hairs will I CARRY you; I have made, and I will bear, even I will CARRY and will deliver you* †. In which passage the word

* סָבַל (Isebel) and נָשָׂא (Nesha) the former of which implies more labour than the latter, and therefore is sometimes placed after it. See Parkhurst's Lex. † Gen. vii. 17.

§ Levit. x. 17. || Ibid xvi. 22. † Isa. xli. 4.

Dial. XVIII. Of CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 191

word is twice used, and the idea seems to be taken from a man's bearing and carrying a burden upon his shoulders. And hence it should seem the writers of the New Testament have taken the phrase, as in the passages already cited.

So that the scripture does not, you see, leave the grand and important affair of Christ's taking away sins in the lax and indeterminate sense some would suggest, i. e. "by whatever means," but evidently fixes the very way, namely, by *bearing them in his own body*, as a man bears a burden, and making a proper expiation for them.

NEO. The passages mentioned seem indeed to throw considerable light upon the subject, and set it in a conspicuous point of view. However, there is one observation more I have met with that I beg leave to mention, which is this : — "Upon the occasion of Christ's healing the bodily diseases of men, he says, that he performed these cures, *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Isaiah, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.* Now," it is asked, "How did Christ *bear* the bodily diseases which he cured? Not, surely", it is said, "by taking them upon himself, and becoming diseased, as the poor wretches themselves had been; but by *removing* them by his miraculous power. In like manner, Christ *bears*, or *takes away* sin, in general; not by suffering himself to be treated as a sinner, but removing it, by the doctrines and motives of his gospel."

PHIL.

PHIL. "*Bears, or takes away sin in general, by the doctrines and motives of his gospel!*" How contrary to the scripture is such an assertion! The *power* of sin in the heart may indeed be broken by the force of those doctrines and motives, but the *guilt* of it, or that obligation to punishment which every sinner is under, must be removed in some other way. And what that way is, the sacred writers, as though they had been conscious of the opposition that would be made to it, are very express in informing us. They tell us, as it has already been observed*, that *Christ appeared to put away sin*, not merely "in general," or "by the doctrines and motives of his gospel," but by THE SACRIFICE OF HIMSELF †. And that he *was ONCE OFFERED to bear the sin of many*; i. e. that he might make expiation, or atonement for it. Which passages must be absolutely decisive with all who pay a proper deference to the scripture, and subject their consciences to its sacred, uncontrollable authority.

"The doctrines and motives of the gospel" then, have nothing at all to do with respect to the expiation of sin, or making satisfaction for it. They have indeed, as we have just observed, and as it may hereafter be more fully shewn, a powerful tendency to weaken its power in the heart; but then one of the chief and most capital doctrines of the gospel is, That *Christ died for*

* Dial, XVI.

† Heb. ix, 26.

Dial. XVIII. Of CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 193

for our sins, or that he redeemed us to God by his blood. A doctrine which whosoever does not believe, though his conduct in life be ever so amiable, yet he is totally destitute of gospel-holiness, and remains wholly alienated from the life of God. For, it is only by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as having *died for our sins*, that our hearts are purified, or our nature sanctified.

As to the passage you have mentioned, it is undeniably evident that the words as recorded in the prophecy, are designed to express the sufferings of Christ for us; since in no other view could he possibly have been *esteemed* STRICKEN, SMITTEN *of God*, and AFFLICTED. And the apostle Peter, it is certain, explains them in this view, when he says, *Christ bare our sins in his own body on the tree,——by whose STRIPES ye were healed.*

NEO. So far seems evident enough: the illustration I have mentioned, I clearly see, will by no means bear the scripture-test.—But then in what sense am I to understand the words in Matthew?

PHIL. Why, I should suppose in this view: Our Saviour you know came into the world on the most benevolent errand. His whole life was one continued series of the exercise of beneficence and mercy; *he went about doing good.* He commiserated the joyless situation of us

poor mortals, and in order to retrieve us from deserved misery he himself cheerfully submitted to it. *He took our griefs and carried our sorrows*; hence he is emphatically called, *A man of sorrows*, and is also said to be *acquainted with grief*.

Since then by sin we had justly forfeited our right even to temporal mercies, and plunged ourselves into a gulph of numberless miseries, the Lord Jesus Christ, in consequence of his engaging in our behalf, was actually deprived of those desirable blessings; and, being found in fashion as a man, drank of the bitter cup of sorrows which was our most just desert. Hence he himself says, in the subsequent context to the passage in hand, *The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head*.

On the whole, our Saviour's healing the bodily diseases of men, his sympathy with them in their comfortless and afflictive situations, and his undergoing the shame, poverty, and grief to which they were exposed, is *one instance* of his carrying our sorrows, or bearing our griefs; but this certainly could not, as is evident from the reasons already assigned, be the whole meaning of the above-cited prophecy. And the consideration that Christ actually suffered the very *punishment* we deserved, is, I should suppose, another decisive proof of it.

NEO. There are persons however, who say they "do not remember it is any where said in the
the

Dial. XVIII. Of CHRIST's SATISFACTION. 195

the New Testament that Christ was *punished for sinners*, or that he died in their stead."

PHIL. And what then? Does a defective memory invalidate the truth, or prevent her enlivening beams from breaking in upon us? It is amazing how exceedingly retentive the memories of some persons are, so that they will keep in mind what is purely ideal, and the creature of their own imagination, while at the same time they seem totally to forget the plainest, and most important truths of the word of God.—They "do not remember" you say, "that Christ was *punished for sinners*." One would have thought that such phrases as these, *Christ BARE our sins, is the PROPITIATION for our sins, a SACRIFICE and an OFFERING to God for us, SUFFERED the just for the unjust, DELIVERED, i. e. to death, for our offences, he SPARED not his own son, but delivered him up for us all, &c.* I say one would have imagined, that some or other of these or similar passages, which like the stars in the firmament shine in the apostolic writings, would have so powerfully irradiated the mind of every reader, that he could not easily have lost sight of them, and have naturally conveyed the idea of the subject spoken of being *punished for sin and sinners*.

However, there is one passage in the New Testament, so very remarkable in itself, and so full to the present purpose, that I am not a little

poor mortals, and in order to retrieve us from deserved misery he himself cheerfully submitted to it. *He took our griefs and carried our sorrows*; hence he is emphatically called, *A man of sorrows*, and is also said to be *acquainted with grief*.

Since then by sin we had justly forfeited our right even to temporal mercies, and plunged ourselves into a gulph of numberless miseries, the Lord Jesus Christ, in consequence of his engaging in our behalf, was actually deprived of those desirable blessings; and, being found in fashion as a man, drank of the bitter cup of sorrows which was our most just desert. Hence he himself says, in the subsequent context to the passage in hand, *The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head*.

On the whole, our Saviour's healing the bodily diseases of men, his sympathy with them in their comfortless and afflictive situations, and his undergoing the shame, poverty, and grief to which they were exposed, is *one instance* of his carrying our sorrows, or bearing our griefs; but this certainly could not, as is evident from the reasons already assigned, be the whole meaning of the above-cited prophecy. And the consideration that Christ actually suffered the very *punishment* we deserved, is, I should suppose, another decisive proof of it.

NEO. There are persons however, who say they "do not remember it is any where said in the
the

Dial. XVIII. Of CHRIST's SATISFACTION. 195

the New Testament that Christ was *punished for sinners*, or that he died in their stead."

PHIL. And what then? Does a defective memory invalidate the truth, or prevent her enlivening beams from breaking in upon us? It is amazing how exceedingly retentive the memories of some persons are, so that they will keep in mind what is purely ideal, and the creature of their own imagination, while at the same time they seem totally to forget the plainest, and most important truths of the word of God.—They "do not remember" you say, "that Christ was *punished for sinners*." One would have thought that such phrases as these, *Christ BARE our sins, is the PROPITIATION for our sins, a SACRIFICE and an OFFERING to God for us, SUFFERED the just for the unjust, DELIVERED, i. e. to death, for our offences, he SPARED not his own son, but delivered him up for us all, &c.* I say one would have imagined, that some or other of these or similar passages, which like the stars in the firmament shine in the apostolic writings, would have so powerfully irradiated the mind of every reader, that he could not easily have lost sight of them, and have naturally conveyed the idea of the subject spoken of being *punished for sin and sinners*.

However, there is one passage in the New Testament, so very remarkable in itself, and so full to the present purpose, that I am not a little

surprized how it should ever be forgot by any who read that sacred book.

NEO. What passage do you refer to?

PHIL. That where the sacred writer says, *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a CURSE for us**. Which words are so plain and exprefs, relative to the *punishment* of Christ in our stead, that I should imagine every attempt to illustrate them is wholly unnecessary.

NEO. The passage is indeed remarkably exprefs; but notwithstanding that, it is said, "if by *accursed* you mean lying under the displeasure of God, this was so far from being the case with respect to Christ, and his death, that in this very circumstance he was the object of the divine approbation, and complacency in the highest degree; as he himself says, *For this reason does my Father love me, because I lay down my life.*"

PHIL. That our Saviour, even in his death, "was the object of the Divine approbation," we readily grant, nay we constantly maintain it, for the reason you have assigned. As the death of Christ was an act of obedience to his Father, doubtless he highly approved of it. Indeed this is represented as the sole ground of his exaltation; he *became obedient unto death, even the death*

* Gal. iii. 13.

Dial. XVIII. Of CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 197

death of the cross, WHEREFORE God also hath highly exalted him*. So far then we are agreed.

But the point in debate is, Whether this be inconsistent with Christ being made *a curse* for us? And one would imagine that since the scripture is so very express respecting it, every objection would be absolutely precluded. But this in fact, it seems, is not the case.

NEO. "It is proper enough to say that Christ died a curse," it is affirmed, "because the manner of his death was similar to that by which those who were deemed *curst* under the law were put to death. But if by accursed you mean lying under the displeasure of God," then it is peremptorily denied that he ever was made a curse.

PHIL. So then the death of Christ it seems, in the opinion of some, is called a *curse*, only "because he died in a state of suspension, which was by the Jews appropriated to those persons who were considered as reprobated by God." And is this all that the scripture means by the emphatical language *he was made a CURSE*? —Will you give me leave to suggest a few queries upon this subject?

NEO. Surely.

PHIL. I would ask then, *Hath not Christ redeemed us from the CURSE OF THE LAW*, by be-

R 3

ing

* Phil. ii. 8, 9.

ing made a CURSE for us? Is not the curse of the law denounced against all who are transgressors of it? or, in scripture language, who *continue not in all things written in the book of the law to do them?* Do not the *curse* of the law, and the *penalty*, or *sanction* of it, mean the same thing? And is not that the sanction of the law, which God inflicts upon the breaker of it? Will not *indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish*, be inflicted *upon every soul of man that doeth evil?* If this be the case, and if Christ was really *made a CURSE* for us, then did he not really bear that very indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish which is evidently denounced against the doer of evil?

The obvious meaning of the apostle then is, that Jesus actually suffered that very punishment which was the sinner's due; and his dying "*in a state of suspension,*" was declarative of it; *for it is written*, adds the apostle, *Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.* And surely none can consider the heart-rending cry, uttered by the Saviour of the world in that hour of darkness, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*, but they must acknowledge that tribulation, wrath, &c. then overwhelmed his comfortless mind.

NEO. Were I ever so much inclined to scepticism, the evidence of scripture relative to vicarious suffering would, I think, entirely banish it all from my mind. I see it is proclaimed by the apostles, as it were *upon the house tops*, and almost by every possible expression. PHIL.

D
tru
tra
fir
upo
gof
thro
with
it ca
A
now
with
ture
price
been
in fo
just t
the a
N
theret
PH
all.
RED
and go
Thou h
Feed t
CHAS
are a sp
See D
vi.

Dial. XVIII. Of CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 199

PHIL. Ay, that *Christ died for our sins* is a truth so important, that the immediate and extraordinary ambassadors of the Prince of peace, *first of all*, or before all other things, insisted upon it. Indeed it was a principal part of the gospel they preached; like a thread, it runs through the whole of their writings; so that without entirely disfiguring or rending them, it can never possibly be separated from them.

As a further proof of this assertion, it might now be shewn how those sacred writers agreed with their royal Master, in representing the nature of his death under the notion of a *ransom price* for sin.—But as this idea has already been insisted upon, as used by our Lord, and in some degree illustrated*, it may suffice here just to mention the texts which relate to it in the apostolic writings.

NEO. I should be glad you would, as I may thereby the better retain them in mind.

PHIL. Christ gave himself a RANSOM for all. *Ye are bought with a PRICE. Ye were not REDEEMED with corruptible things, as silver and gold,—but with the precious blood of Christ. Thou hast REDEEMED us to God by thy blood. Feed the church of God, which he hath PURCHASED with his own blood†.* These passages are a specimen of what the inspired writers say of

* See Dialogue XV. Page 116 † See 1 Tim. ii. 5. 1 Cor. vi. 20, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. Rev. v. 9. Acts xx. 28.

of the death of Christ, as a price paid for the redemption of sinners ; in which his *life*, or his *blood*, is the consideration expressly assigned and insisted on ; so that one would suppose that no person could believe the New Testament of divine authority, who did not embrace that doctrine which projects so much to our notice, and makes so distinguished, and capital a figure in it.

Upon the whole, the glorious truth of our Saviour's satisfaction, thro' the apostolic writings particularly, is represented in so great a variety of language, that, till they be expunged from the canon of scripture, it will stand more firm than the *everlasting mountains*, or the *perpetual hills*.

In vain is it said that " our being bought with a *price*, and Christ's being our *ransom*, when divested of figure, mean no more than a *remarkable deliverance*"——that it must " be a considerable drawback on the love of God the Father"——or that " Christ may be said to redeem—by his precepts, by his example, and by the precious promises of his gospel ;" it is vain and fruitless, I say, to urge such stale objections as these, since they can never embarrass even the weakest person, who reads the scripture with an honest mind.—You will join with me in this I doubt not Neophytus.

NEO. Yes ; for it is easy to reply, That the deplorable situation we are redeemed from, was the being exposed to the *curse of the law*, or the *wrath*

Dial

wrat
neit
but
most
tion,
love
striki
judg

Pr
scrip
Chri
I sho
not t
men.
may,
And
" aut
beral
never
was n
heads
they o
themf
scious
Divin
rily sta

NE
as our
useless

wrath to come;—That Christ redeemed us neither by “precepts, promises, nor example,” but by being *made a curse for us*, or by his own most *precious blood*;—And that this redemption, so far from being “a drawback on the love of God the Father,” is a distinguished and striking expression of it, it being in the apostle’s judgment *according to the riches of his grace* *.

PHIL. Such then is the evidence that the scripture gives of the consolatory doctrine of Christ’s satisfaction for sin. Evidence which, I should imagine, is irresistible; and I am sure not to be refuted, by all the wit and artifice of men. Attempt to darken or obscure it they may, but subvert or destroy it they cannot. And this I take to be the true reason why many “authors,” who some think have “more liberal and enlarged thoughts” than others, could never fairly deny the truth of this doctrine. It was not because “they had got *systems* into their heads in the early period of life, from which they could never afterward entirely emancipate themselves;” but rather because they were conscious that the satisfaction of Christ, and the Divine original of the scriptures, must necessarily stand or fall together.

NEO. I am entirely of your opinion. But as our adversaries represent the doctrine as an useless speculation at best, and often very pernicious

* Eph. i. 7.

nicious ; as “ the *tendency and consequences* of it, it is thought, are sufficient to overthrow it, independent of all other arguments ;” would it not be worth our while to consider these ? at least your thoughts on this subject would be very acceptable to me.—You have indeed demonstrated to me the real existence of this sin-destroying weapon. do shew me how to make use of it.

PHIL. Let us join our petitions to God, that he would put this weapon into our hands, and give us courage and skill to use it in his service.—However, there is so much weight in what you say, that, at a convenient opportunity, after enumerating the blessings procured by the death of our Lord, I shall be very glad to converse with you upon the subject you have mentioned.

D I A-

Di

NEO
pleasu
rather
have l

PH
seems

NE
ing m
to my

PHI
hear y
manne
our sub
which
of his l

D I A L O G U E X I X .

NEO. **I** Began to be apprehensive Philanthropos that I should not have the pleasure of seeing you this evening; and the rather, since I wanted to renew the subject we have been pretty frequently upon.

PHIL. You do not grow weary of it then it seems Neophytus?

NEO. Weary, no; 'tis as the most ravishing music in my ears, or as a reviving cordial to my heart.

PHIL. It is not a little pleasing to me, to hear you speak in so feeling and affectionate a manner.—Let us then immediately enter upon our subject. We were to speak of the blessings which our Lord procured for us by the shedding of his blood, were we not?

NEO.

NEO. Yes ; that was your proposal yesterday evening : And then of its tendency upon the mind, where it is cordially received and embraced.

PHIL. Very well : We will begin then with the first, namely, the invaluable blessings which Jesus has procured for us sinners, by his obedience unto death. These, like stars, appear numberless in the firmament of the scriptures. When I contemplate this subject,

*My soul is caught ;
Heaven's sovereign blessings, clustering from the cross,
Rush on her in a throng, and close her round,
The prisoner of amaze !*

YOUNG.

NEO. The cross of Christ, I believe, is a fertile tree ; and the fruit that it produces is of the most refreshing and salutary nature.

PHIL. Ay, and is suited to every palate too ; I mean to all who are capable of relishing it : For, a sacred writer tells us, that *the tree of life* which the angel shewed him, *bore twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month ; and,* he adds, *the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations* *. And you know that Christ is *an High Priest of GOOD THINGS TO COME* † : Many good things, many capital favours are conferred upon us as the certain effect of his glorious undertaking. Indeed every blessing we enjoy

* Rev. xxii. 1, 2.

† Heb. ix. 11.

Dial. XIX. BY CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 205

enjoy flows to us through that channel : Hence believers in the Lord Jesus Christ are said to be *blessed with ALL spiritual blessings—in Christ*. All things pertaining to life and godliness are given them in Christ their living head.

NEO. I could wish you would more particularly enumerate those blessings, as I trust it might be conducive to my spiritual profit.

PHIL. Very well : The first then that I shall mention, as it seems naturally to present itself first to view, is, the *pardon of sin*.—You remember I doubt not the apostle Peter's declaration concerning this, in his pathetic address to Cornelius and his family, when he first opened the door of faith to the Gentile world.

NEO. I have the bible at hand, I will read it over.—*To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him, shall receive REMISSION OF SINS* *. It is indeed exceedingly clear from this passage, that the blessing of remission is obtained solely through the Lord Jesus Christ.

PHIL. And it is no less clear that all the prophets bore *witness* to this too ; so that prophetic testimonies of this kind, were they necessary, might fairly be produced upon this occasion. But for the gaining of time we will entirely omit them †.—You shall turn then, if
VOL. II. S you

* Acts x. 43. † See among other passages, Jer. xxxi. 34.
Micah. vii. 18.

you please, to Paul's declaration relative to the same thing, at Antioch in Pisidia, and you will find the two brethren exactly agreed.

NEO. *Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the FORGIVENESS OF SINS* *.

PHIL. The pardon of sin then you see, is only to be enjoyed by believing in Christ. *Thousands of rams, or ten thousands of rivers of oil,* were they to be obtained, would be found a price far too inadequate for so capital a blessing. But what we could not possibly do, Jesus, the Captain of our salvation hath most gloriously effected. And therefore the apostles confidently and repeatedly asserted, both with respect to themselves and other believers, *we have redemption THROUGH HIS BLOOD, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace* †.

The sacred writers you see, are quite peremptory in this affair. They considered forgiveness as one capital branch of Christ's redemption, as being procured for us solely by the shedding of his blood,—received immediately upon believing in him,—and an instance of unparalleled, super-abounding grace.—Now, what think you of those passages Neophytus?

NEO. I think them remarkably striking and explicit. They certainly are decisive proofs,
that

* Acts xiii. 38. † Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14.

that pardon is to be enjoyed only thro' the Lord Jesus Christ; and though entirely procured by the shedding of his blood, yet is wholly free with respect to *us*.

PHIL. Ay, in God's account it is so; and one would naturally imagine that he is the best judge.—Notwithstanding then men wrangle and contend, for what they call “the free and unbought pardon of their sins,” yet it will remain an incontestible truth, to all who pay a deference to scripture authority, that the blood of Christ is the sole *consideration* of our pardon, though the riches of Divine grace are admirably unfolded in the manner of conferring it.

NEO. It is said that the “shedding of Christ's blood, as *such*, could have nothing acceptable or propitiating in it, any more than the blood of sacrificial animals, which is declared, over and over, to be of no moment; and therefore could be no inducement to forgive offending creatures.” But this declaration I perceive now, is as far distant from truth and scripture “as the west is from the rising sun.”

PHIL. It is certainly false in all its parts: For, even the blood of sacrificial animals was available in some respects: If we may believe the apostle, it did really *sanctify to the purifying of the FLESH*; though, as we have before observed, it could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the CONSCIENCE.—And

with respect to the blood of Christ, though it may be *counted an unholy thing by many*, as it is by the author of the passage you have quoted, yet it is certain the scripture calls it **PRECIOUS**, and whether we must believe God or man it may be left to every one to judge for himself; only let him keep this in mind, That **GOD** must be true, though every *man* should be found a liar.

Passing this, we will go on to consider another important gospel blessing, inseparably connected with the former, and equally procured by the Lord Jesus Christ. I mean the blessing of *justification*. This important favour, which, in the sense I here use it *, is nothing less than **A DECLARED RIGHT TO ETERNAL LIFE**, is evidently spoken of in the oracles of truth, as flowing through the channel of the Redeemer's blood. For the proof of this assertion, I must again refer you to Paul's celebrated discourse at Antioch.—Read over the thirty-ninth verse.

NEO. *And BY HIM all that believe are JUSTIFIED from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses †.*

PHIL.

* Justification in scripture seems to be a collective word, and is frequently used to express *pardon*, as well as a *title to eternal life*.—But, as it is used in the same sentence with pardon; as it is expressly called *justification of LIFE*; and as not only *abundance of grace*, but also *the gift of righteousness* is necessary to be *received* in order to the enjoyment of it; we may justly, I should imagine, consider these blessings as distinct, though not separate. † Acts xiii. 39.

PHIL. It is by faith in CHRIST then, you see, that a guilty sinner is justified, or has a pleadable right to the heavenly inheritance. Not indeed from any intrinsic value there is in faith, for no such honour is put upon it; but purely on account of that glorious righteousness, which faith, as the hand, thankfully receives. Hence we read, that *as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto JUSTIFICATION OF LIFE*.*

Further; if possible to anticipate every objection, and preclude what is urged in opposition to our sentiment respecting satisfaction, especially that "common and hackneyed objection," that "it is impossible to reconcile it with the doctrine of free grace, which—is so fully displayed in—the justification of sinners;" to destroy the force of this, it may be observed, that the scripture asserts in the clearest and strongest manner, that there is a perfect, uninterrupted harmony between these two. — The following passage I should imagine, is an undeniable proof of this. *Being justified FREELY BY HIS GRACE, THROUGH THE REDEMPTION that is in Jesus Christ* †.

Now, Is it not incontestibly evident from these words, that the justification of a sinner is absolutely free? And Is it not equally evident, that this invaluable free-grace blessing is procur-

S 3

ed

* Rom. v. 18.

† Rom. iii. 24.

ed by the Lord Jesus Christ? or is conferred as the effect of his glorious redemption.

NEO. Certainly it is; but I am told that "the meaning of the latter clause," in the text you have quoted, "must be interpreted in such a manner as to make it consistent with the former; and it is far from requiring any force or straining of the text to do it."

PHIL. Doubtless: for, as there is a perfect harmony among all the parts of scripture, surely it will appear between the different clauses of the same verse. Indeed, if this were not the case, its Divine authority would be justly and entirely destroyed.

NEO. Yes, but the author I refer to means, that "if the justification of sinners be of *free grace*," it can have no respect to the doctrine of *satisfaction*, according to your view of it.

PHIL. Well, in what manner is the latter clause to be interpreted then?

NEO. Why, "it is only necessary to suppose that our redemption from the power of sin, i. e. our repentance and reformation,—is promoted by the gospel of Jesus Christ."

PHIL. "Only necessary to suppose" that two things quite distinct in their own natures are the same! Only suppose that there is no fixed meaning of the words of scripture, and then

then you may put upon them what meaning you please!—The text you say “is far from requiring any force or straining,” to leave out the satisfaction of the Lord Jesus Christ; and yet it must be so cruelly distorted, as the instance you have given clearly evinces, that its distinguishing features are wholly undiscernable.

“Repentance and reformation” the same as redemption! Miserable subterfuge! Such pitiful evasions, were there no other evidence, will sufficiently convince every discerning person, of the weakness and fallacy of that cause which they were designed to serve and promote.

Notwithstanding then the warm opposition made to it, the doctrine of free justification, through the Lord Jesus Christ, remains an unshaken truth. It remains undeniably evident, from scripture testimony, that the blessing we are speaking of, as well as that of pardon, is entirely owing to the undertaking of Christ.

NEO. What you have observed reminds me of the apostle's triumphant challenge: *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?* and particularly of the reasons he assigns as the ground of it. *It is Christ that DIED;—nay, rather that is RISEN AGAIN.* So that it is evident, he considers what Christ has done for us, as a full and sufficient answer to every accuser; which seems fully to corroborate the truth of your argument.

PHIL.

PHIL. Inseparably connected with justification is *peace with God**; for *we who have believed*, an inspired writer asserts, *do*, immediately upon believing, *enter into rest*. And this rest, or peace, the same infallible casuist declares, is only to be enjoyed THROUGH our Lord Jesus Christ §. — He hath made peace through the blood of his cross †: He is the author of the inestimable blessing; and, in believing, that peace is effectually produced in the heart.

Indeed a sinner, conscious of the just demerit of his sins, cannot possibly obtain peace in any other way. Could he, the scripture would be falsified, since it declares it is only to be enjoyed through Christ. He may attempt indeed to acquire it by some other means, but they all will prove like *refuges of lies*, they will fail in the time of trial. But what need is there to refer to others, I appeal to yourself, whether, when God discovered to you your ruined state, and brought you in *guilty before him*, you found peace in any thing short of an entire reliance upon the Lord Jesus Christ? Whether you were freed from the accusations of a guilty conscience, before the SON had made you free?

NEO. With respect to myself, I must ingenuously confess, I obtained no *true* peace, till I was enabled to *believe with the heart unto righteousness*. Conscious of my just desert of punishment, as a transgressor of the Divine law; hearing

* Rom. v. 1.

§ Ibid.

† Col. i. 19.

Dial. XIX. BY CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 213

hearing its dreadful, heart-rending anathemas denounced against me ; I saw not the least possibility of safety but through the atoning blood of Jesus, nor enjoyed any relief of mind till through grace I actually *fled for refuge, to lay hold on the hope set before me* in the gospel.

PHIL. Well, and how has your peace been maintained ? I suppose it has suffered some interruptions at least : When broken, How has it been restored ?

NEO. In the very same way in which it was first produced. By a view of Jesus as the *Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world*. I have found that nothing short of this could ever effect its restoration when once it was broken.

PHIL. No, nor ever will : Christ alone is *our peace* in every point of view. Did the serpent-bitten Israelite look to the brazen serpent upon the pole, to receive healing for his wounds : Was he immediately to repeat the look upon every repeated bite, in order that he might not die thereby : So the sin-stung person must look directly to Jesus, the grand antitype of the brazen serpent, to receive healing for his spiritual maladies, and eradicate the mortal poison of sin. And if the believer, overcome by the temptations of the devil—the allurements of the world—or the law in his members that wars against the law of his mind, fall into sin, so as to break his peace, and bring guilt into the conscience,

science, the remedy is the same; still, in the language of an inspired prophet, *this man is the peace when these Assyrians come into our land.*—It is the blood of *Jesus Christ*, and that alone, that *cleanseth us from all sin*; both from the guilt and pollution of it.

If then peace of conscience be produced, and afterwards maintained by the Lord *Jesus Christ*, that is, by believing views of his having died for our sins, then surely it demonstrates the truth of his satisfaction; and shews, in the clearest point of view, how available his sufferings are, with an infinitely holy and sin-hating God. And should it at last be found a truth, that Christ died to effectuate a peace between God and the sinner; should it at the times of the restitution of all things appear, that without faith in his blood we shall be justly and finally condemned; how inconceivably awful will the situation of those be, who have counted that blood an *unholy*, or unprofitable thing! Who have asserted; that “as to *hereafter*,—men shall be dealt with according to the respective merit or demerit of their characters, without any reference at all to a *Satisfaction*.” And, as you have represented it, have affirmed, that “Christ’s shedding his blood, as *such*, could have nothing acceptable or propitiating in it, any more than the blood of sacrificial animals.”

NEO. It is indeed much to be desired, that such persons might see their error in time, before

Dial. XIX. BY CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 215

fore the retraction of it can be of no service to them.

PHIL. Ay, but alas ! how few comparatively there are, who escape from so fatal a snare. So true is it, that *the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them who BELIEVE NOT, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ,—should shine unto them.*

It may be observed further, that as pardon, justification, and peace, are blessings conferred through the satisfaction of Jesus; so *adoption into the family of heaven*, that chief and capital favour, is granted entirely on the same account.

NEO. Is the scripture clear with respect to that?

PHIL. As clear as the sun :—You may remember that God himself, by the mouth of his prophet, propounds an important question respecting it. *How shall I put thee, a poor, polluted, hell-deserving sinner, among the children?* A question absolutely unanswerable by men or angels. To devise a plan how this may be done, so as that the Divine perfections, particularly the justice, holiness, and veracity of God, may appear unfulfilled, is an act worthy of infinite wisdom.

Influenced however by rich grace, and compassionating our distressful circumstances, the Father of mercies hath given a full solution to

it.—

it.—*And I said, Thou shalt call me MY FATHER* * ; the greatest thing that God could have said.

NEO. The passage is indeed express relative to our adoption, but I think it says nothing of its being through the Lord Jesus Christ.

PHIL. Very true ; but there are various other passages, which may be considered as comments upon this, that tell us plainly how so amazing a work is effected.—What think you of this : *Having predestinated us to the adoption of children BY JESUS CHRIST to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will* † .

NEO. I think the blessing itself is evidently spoken of, and the way of conveyance particularly specified ; *by Jesus Christ*.

PHIL. Very well ; so far then all is clear. And should it be enquired further, By what means did Jesus procure this invaluable favour for us ? The answer is, *God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, TO REDEEM them that were under the law, that, or in order that we might receive the adoption of sons* § . You see then, Christ procured this favour by being made under the law, and paying that very price which it required to free us *from its curse*.

NEO. How express is the scripture ! One would imagine that the Holy Ghost had made particular

* Jer. iii. 19. † Eph. i. 5. § Gal. iv. 45.

Dial. XIX. BY CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 217

particular provision against those soul-destroying errors so much in vogue.

PHIL. Ay, and he is no less clear with respect to the way we come to enjoy it. *As many as RECEIVED Christ, to them gave he power, right, or privilege, to become the sons of God, even to them that BELIEVE on his name* *. And again ; *Ye are all the children of God by FAITH in Christ Jesus* †. Adoption into the family of heaven then, you see, is a fruit of our Saviour's death, as well as the favours beforementioned ; and we are truly constituted the children of God, and have the nature of children imparted to us, when we are enabled, thro' grace, to believe.

Add to these things already specified, the inestimable blessing of communion with God, which is the animating spirit of religion, and destitute of which it is no more than a lifeless form. We have *boldness to enter into the holiest BY THE BLOOD OF JESUS, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh* §.

NEO. A passage relative to what you are now observing occurs to my mind, which I think is full to the purpose.

PHIL. What passage do you refer to ?

NEO. To one part of that which has already been quoted ; I mean the apostle's declaration
VOL. II. T respecting

* John i. 12.

† Gal. iii. 26.

§ Heb. x. 19, 20.

respecting our justification by faith, and peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. You know it is immediately subjoined, *By whom also we have ACCESS BY FAITH into this grace wherein we stand**; that is, I suppose, we have freedom and fellowship with God as a God of grace, through the mediation of our dear Redeemer.

PHIL. Very right; we approach him as our reconciled Father, and never-failing friend.

There are many other important favours that are procured by the shedding of the Redeemer's blood, that might be enumerated if it were necessary. It might be observed, that our meetness for glory, and our actual enjoyment of it; our victory over death, and resurrection from the grave; all flow from the same source.—But I forbear.—I leave them entirely to your own reflection.—Only permit me to sum up the argument.

NEO. Surely.

PHIL. If then pardon, justification, adoption, and all spiritual blessings be procured for us by the Lord Jesus Christ; if they flow through the channel of his blood; and if, in short, so far as we can see from the revelation of God's will, they could not have been enjoyed by sinners in any other way; what we call the satisfaction of Christ is, I should imagine,

* Rom. v. ii.

gine, clearly demonstrated.—Had not our Lord been the meritorious cause of them, why should they be represented to us in the above-mentioned manner? If “the shedding of Christ’s blood; *as such*, had nothing acceptable or propitiating in it,” why might not Paul be said *to be crucified for us*, and we enjoy those blessings by believing in Paul?

NEO. The argument appears to me sufficiently strong and convincing.—I could with however you would enlarge a little upon one of the blessings you have just mentioned, I mean our meetness for glory, or sanctification.

PHIL. Certainly; and the rather, because it will naturally lead us to consider the tendency of the doctrine.

NEO. That is the very reason of my request. For, you know, I make no doubt, that there is no objection so frequently, nor perhaps so plausibly urged against the satisfaction of Christ, as its immoral tendency. It is affirmed “to operate upon the heart and life, perhaps more fatally than any other religious opinion whatever.”—Nay it is even said, that “the *tendency and consequences* of the Calvinistic scheme of atonement, are sufficient to overthrow it, independent of all other arguments.”

PHIL. Indeed! If that be the case they must be highly destructive. But how is its pernicious

ous tendency proved? Who shall decide in the present affair?

NEO. What does the scripture say of it?

PHIL. The scripture, if it must be the judge, gives, I think, a clear decision in our favour.

NEO. Where.

PHIL. In almost every page, where the Lord Jesus Christ is spoken of.

To instance: We are told that he is *made of God unto us*—SANCTIFICATION*. That *He loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might SANCTIFY and CLEANSE it, and present it to himself a glorious church†*. That *we are SANCTIFIED by faith in the Son of God§*. And you know Neophytus, our Lord himself prayed, that his people might be *SANCTIFIED through the truth†*. Nay, this he assigns as the principal reason why he sanctified himself||. So that gospel truth, where it is cordially embraced, will operate powerfully upon the heart, and like the showers in spring, be productive of the most beneficial and salutary consequences. The doctrine of *Christ crucified*, if we may credit inspiration, will certainly *bring forth fruit*, in all who *hear it, and know the grace of God in truth***.

So far then is the doctrine of satisfaction from operating “more fatally than any other religious

* 1 Cor. i. 30. † Eph. v. 25—28. § Acts xxvi. 18.

† John xvii. 17. || Verse 19. ** Col. i. 6.

Dial. XIX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 221

religious opinion," that, on the contrary, it hath the most happy effect. And this it must necessarily have. For, the grand and striking views it always exhibits, to those who cordially embrace it, cannot but influence their minds, to the practice of genuine holiness. They are particularly calculated to win the heart, and put all the powers of the soul into motion.

NEO. If this be its natural tendency, it unquestionably evinces its heavenly original. For "the tendency of any doctrine, and the influence which it naturally has on the morals of mankind, are either its best recommendation, or its strongest confutation." Nay, "this is our Saviour's own rule, *By their fruits ye shall know them**; the fruits which they have a tendency and fitness to produce."

But, it is positively asserted, that "the doctrine of *Christ's satisfaction*, in the calvinistic sense of it, is a destructive one, and that lays the axe to the root of religion and morals."

PHIL. Were *that* the case; did the principles that we maintain, "lead to the neglect of duty, the violation of the moral law, or in any degree relax its obligation," then, I confess, their divine original might justly be suspected; nay, such consequences would indisputably evince their falshood. For, it is observable, that the friends as well as the opposers of satisfaction,

T 3. uniformly

* Matt. vii. 20.

uniformly maintain, "That the best and surest criterion of religious principles is their moral influence."—But the question is, In what manner must we form our judgement of this? What shall be the ground of the evidence of the above-mentioned tendency?

NEO. Its effects, I should suppose. This is the way by which we judge of every other kind of tendency, and therefore by the same method we should judge of this. If, for example, I should observe a tree, which, for a succession of years, should bring forth bad fruit, I should thence conclude, that it had a *tendency* so to do, and that it must certainly be a bad tree. And if, on the contrary, I observed another tree which successively produced good fruit, the conclusion would likewise be, that it had a *tendency* to do this, and that therefore it was certainly a good tree.

PHIL. Your remark is unquestionably right. For we cannot, I think, ever obtain the idea of such a thing as tendency in any other way than by observation. Now, in the present case, holiness, in its fruits, is the only thing that we can observe; and therefore, if we would form a true judgement, we must give a particular attention to that.

‘ If, then, it appeared in fact, that those who embrace the doctrine of satisfaction, upon a fair and just comparison, were more loose in their
practice

Dial. XIX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 223

practice than their adversaries of any of the opposite opinions, it would be a strong prejudice against it; or rather if this were always the case, it would, as we have already observed, be an unquestionable evidence of its falsehood. But, doth not the contrary appear on the very face of the world? Are not the persons who profess to deny their own righteousness, and hope for justification through Christ, ordinarily the most tender and fearful of sinning themselves, and the most faithful and diligent in promoting the reformation of others? I could almost appeal to any one, who hath the least experience of, or commerce with the world, whether he would expect to find, upon a strict search and enquiry, the worship of God more constantly attended, the name of God more regularly called upon in families, children and servants more carefully instructed, and more dutifully governed, a greater freedom from levity, profanity, unchastity, pride, malice, or insincerity of conversation, amongst the friends or enemies of this doctrine?

Nay, these things have been so evident, in every age of christianity, that the persons above-mentioned have generally had the appellation of the *stricter sort*. Puritans and Precisians were the terms by which they were formerly distinguished, and still they have similar appellations given to them, by those who decry their religious sentiments. So that if we form our judgement

ment in this matter by the foregoing rule, we must, I think, decide in favour of those, who, like the great apostle, *count all things but loss,—that they may win Christ, and be found in him.*

NEO. A modern writer upon this subject, after observing that “It has been urged in favour of Calvinism, that its votaries are more attentive to religious requirements, more sober and devout than any other denomination whatever;” adds, “this, however, I do very much suspect the truth of. In point of external modes, and forms, the argument, I will allow, is in their favour. These they are very tenacious of, and so far they merit our esteem. In other respects, I am afraid, they will not appear to advantage upon the comparison.”

PHIL. If by “external modes and forms,” we are to understand the whole of that *reasonable service* which the Author of our being, in consequence of that relation, indispensably requireth of us, then the question in debate is fairly granted. But if the author means only the way and manner in which we think a church of Christ ought to be formed and governed, then a particular part only of what is observed above, relative to the people commonly called Calvinists, is granted; and for the rest we are willing to appeal to common observation.

But I am inclined to think, from the *manner* in which your author expresses himself, that,
not-

notwithstanding all the appearances of pure religion among the above-mentioned people, yet he very much suspects that they are guilty of hypocrisy. Such a charge however, is extremely disingenuous, and has scarce even the probability of truth to support it. For who, we may ask, since the first promulgation of Christianity, have suffered more for their adherence to the gospel, than those who have believed in the Lord Jesus, as the TRUE GOD *and eternal life*? Or whose hope of eternal life hath been founded solely upon his vicarious death?

Indeed, the charge of hypocrisy is plainly begging the question. For, if *appearances* are the only objects from which we can form a judgement in the present case; if to search the heart be the sole prerogative of *the God who is above*; then our determination must unquestionably be entirely grounded upon these appearances. Consequently, the denying of them, or the charging of them with being hypocritical, is, in fact, to preclude all evidence in this case. It is a manifest rejection of the rule which our Saviour himself hath given, and a vile, ungentleman, unchristian like reflection on the most respectable, and best established characters.

That there are hypocrites among the persons of whom we are now speaking, is readily allowed; nor was it ever, that I remember, denied by any one. But then, to infer from particular persons, that the whole collective

body

body is of this class, is a most fallacious way of reasoning. Was there not a *hypocrite*, a *traitor*, nay a *devil**, among the immediate followers of Jesus himself? And must we conclude hence that they all were so? Or that the doctrines which he taught had a direct tendency to make men hypocrites? I leave you to judge.

NEO. "That there are good men among them, men of the strictest honour and integrity, is allowed; but, nevertheless, for this," it is affirmed, "they seem indebted to better principles than their own peculiar ones." That is to say, to "principles of *nature's* planting. But for these," it is further asserted, "a Calvinist would be a consistent being throughout, and form his practice upon his principles. And in that case, and on that supposition, we should have full as much occasion for *gibbets* as we have for churches §."

PHIL.

* John vi. 70. § The writer of these sentences complains of the want of "politeness and humanity" in his opposers. But I am inclined to think, that no serious reader will conclude, from the above-mentioned expressions, that he is so much as endeavouring to *overcome evil with good*. Do not the *heat of temper*, and *asperity of diction* contained in them, evidently show, that the author is too much influenced by *nature's* principles? Can he judge the heart, and know the secret springs by which it is constantly actuated? If not, doth he not expressly contradict the united testimony of thousands, who uniformly declare, that the *love of Christ*, manifested in the laying down of his life for them, is the powerful motive which *constrains* them to obedience? But to deny the truth, though ever so strongly attested, is perfectly agreeable to nature's principles; for we go *astray as soon as we are born, speaking LIES*.

PHIL. That is a heavy charge indeed. But it is, I am well persuaded, entirely unsupported, either by argument or fact. And to show that it hath not so much as the *shadow* of truth to confirm it, is, in my apprehension, exceedingly easy. For, the grand principle from which a Calvinist, if we must use the term*, professedly acts; the animating spring of his obedience, is the stupendous love of the DIVINE THREE, manifested in the redemption of guilty man. And this it must be allowed is the noblest, and most godlike motive.

Nature's principles therefore, have no influence at all with respect to the believer's obedience to the will of God. No, so far is the real Christian from being indebted to the principles of nature, for any part of the fruit which he produces, that, on the contrary, it is his constant endeavour entirely to eradicate them. He considers them as his greatest foes; and, as much as lies in his power, accelerates their final destruction.

However, to show you still more fully the absurdity and falsity of the position of your author,

* The author professes himself no friend to party names or distinctions, nor would he ever have used any one of them, had he not been obliged to it by the writer he is opposing, who seems to use the term Calvinist as a term of reproach. Now, though the author dislikes those names in themselves, and much more when used in a reproachful manner, yet he will not take it amiss to be called a Calvinist for the sake of distinction, though he utterly disclaims any dependence upon Calvin, and does not believe in every thing just as he taught.

thor, I will endeavour to evince, that a cordial belief of the satisfaction of Christ, as we have already stated it, so far from relaxing our obligations to the great Creator, strongly and indissolubly confirms them, and is the most powerful incentive to holiness in all its branches. Or, in other words, is the great mean of our sanctification.

NEO. Is that clear from the scripture ?

PHIL. Exceedingly clear : and not less so from Christian experience. For, all who have received the truth in the love of it, feel its power upon their heart ; and “ the consequences of their doctrines, which their adversaries are weak enough to charge upon them, they do absolutely disclaim and disavow.”

NEO. It is allowed “ many of them do,” but “ not all ;” for, on the contrary, it is affirmed, the “ devotees” of satisfaction have oft been heard to reason in this manner : “ If Christ suffered for us, and in our room, and also obeyed the law of God for us (both which we believe he did) we do not see the propriety of our doing any thing, or of paying the least attention to gospel injunctions, as rules of life. A carnal unelected world may regard them, as they please, but we think ourselves happy in being delivered from them.”

PHIL.

PHIL. Did you ever hear any of those who maintain the doctrine of satisfaction reason in that manner ?

NEO. No, never.

PHIL. Nor I ; and it may, I think, justly be suspected, whether there be, in fact, any such to hear.

NEO. But the author referred to has, he says, heard them, and heard them “ oft” too.

PHIL. I have conversed upon that subject with some persons, who *have been young, and now are old*, and who have had more frequent opportunities of attending where the doctrine of satisfaction was preached than ever your author had, and yet they never heard any such thing ; nor indeed any thing that bore the most distant resemblance to it. So that till some further proof be given, we must beg leave to suspend our assent, and think it an assertion a little too hasty. Let such a “ devotee” be produced, or the charge retracted : And supposing one could be produced, the doctrine of satisfaction would not surely be overturned, merely through the error of a single individual.

Being partakers of a *divine nature*, real believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, like the great apostle, *delight in the law of God after the inward man* ; and with their minds they constantly *serve* that law, and therefore undoubtedly

consider it as "a rule of life."——But, passing this, together with the sneering ludicrous expression, "a carnal unelected world," we will proceed to the proof of our position, namely, that a cordial belief of the satisfaction of Christ is the most powerful incentive to gospel holiness.

NEO. I am extremely sorry that I cannot continue the conversation any longer at present. I promised to meet a person at this hour, and I think we ought to be punctual to our engagements of that nature.

PHIL. Certainly; and therefore I should think it wrong in the least to detain you beyond your time.——At another opportunity we will endeavour to discuss it.

D I A-

DIALOGUE XX.

PHIL. **W**ELL, Neophytus, shall we resume our old subject once more this evening?

NEO. It was what I expected, Philanthropos, and to say the truth, was the chief cause of my visit at this time.

PHIL. What we had in view the last night, I think, was to evince, that the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction, as already explained, has a most salutary tendency upon the mind, wherever it is cordially embraced; and, so far from having "an unfriendly aspect on religion and morals," or "operating more fatally than any

other religious opinion whatever," that, on the contrary, like a healthful river, it waters the tree at the root, and causes it, like Aaron's rod, to bud, blossom, and bring forth fruit.

NEO. Some persons however think, that "the doctrine of Christ's atonement, as believed by the bulk of professed Christians, opens a wide gap for the introduction of such evils into society, as would soon sap the foundations of it, were it not checked by better principles of nature's planting."

PHIL. Principles of nature's planting check the evils! Alas! they are far too slender a barrier. Slender a barrier did I say? I retract the expression. Far from being a "check" or barrier, the principles of nature's planting are the sole cause of that deluge of wickedness which overspreads the face of the world, and threatens the entire destruction of the whole. Nay, so exceedingly vicious are they, that were they not counteracted by the heaven-born principles of grace, like some rapid torrent, they would irresistibly drive us into the ocean of misery.

Man, you know, we are told in sacred writ, *is born like a wild asses colt* *. And if we take our idea of the wild ass, from the elegant description that Job gives of him, we shall have little reason to boast of "nature's principles." You remember the passage I dare say.

NEO.

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 233

NEO. I will read it if you please.—*Who hath sent out the wild asfs free? or who hath loosed the bands of the wild asfs? Whose house I have made the wilderness, and the barren land his dwellings. He scorneth the multitude of the city, neither regardeth he the crying of the driver. The range of the mountains is his pasture, and he searcheth after every green thing**.—How striking the passage!

PHIL. Striking indeed! There man is delineated with the greatest exactness, and his portrait drawn in its native colours. And its deformity will more evidently appear, if we add another passage from the same book. *How much more abominable and filthy is man who drinketh iniquity like water*†.—Leaving then the patrons of nature, like so many wild asses, to boast of their goodly principles, let us attend more immediately to the subject in hand.—We have to evince, you know, that the doctrine of satisfaction, understood and believed, is the most powerful incitement to gospel holiness.

NEO. I shall attend to the reasons of your assertion with pleasure.

PHIL. *Do we make void the law through faith?* includes the substance of an old and threadbare objection against our acceptance in the Lord Jesus Christ. But, with what just abhorrence, and deserved contempt, does the apostle explode it! *God forbid!* We detest the

W 3

very

* Job xxxix. 5—9. † Ibid xv. 16.

very thought of it. As though he had said to the objector, You quite mistake our principles : You look at them through a false medium ; for, so far are we from being justly chargeable with what you would insinuate concerning us, that, on the contrary, *we ESTABLISH the law**. We fix it upon an immoveable basis, and, conscious of its great utility, set it in the most beautiful, honourable, and striking point of light.

So that you see, Neophytus, this noble champion for the gospel, not only denies the justness of the objection, but fully establishes the contrary truth. He positively asserts, fearless of contradiction, that the law is *established*, either in speculation or practice, only by those who embrace the satisfaction of Christ. A clear and forcible sense of obligation is discerned by those ; for, previous to their embracing the above-mentioned doctrine, they have a full conviction of the purity, extent, and duration of the Divine law ;—of their utter inability to comply with the requirements of it ;—and of the justness of the Divine procedure in condemning its transgressors to eternal ruin ; consequently they must have a strong sense of the obligation they are under, diligently and constantly to obey it as a rule of life.

NEO. You think that is the case with all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.

PHIL.

* Rom. iii. 31

PHIL. Undoubtedly. Hear the language of one of them as the mouth of the rest.—*I was alive WITHOUT THE LAW once*; that is, without the knowledge of its spirituality and great extent: *but when the commandment CAME*, when a perception was given me of its extensive requirements, both with respect to God and men, *sin revived*, it appeared in all its malignant colours and its amazing strength was sensibly felt; *and I died**, my former towering hopes were entirely slain, and I was brought in *guilty before God*.—Like a man deprived of vital heat, he was absolutely *without strength†* with respect to the law, and, according to his own expression, was really *DEAD in trespasses and sins*.

Now, in this situation it was, that he embraced the satisfaction of Christ. As a hopeless, helpless, justly-condemned sinner, he was enabled through grace to believe.—Would such views then dissolve, or even weaken, his preceding obligations to the law? Would he afterwards consider himself as being *without law to God*? By no means. His sense of obligation would be considerably increased.

NEO. “If a full satisfaction on the part of sinners be made to all the demands of divine justice,” some “do not see what business you or I have with *moral obligation*, farther than we are bound by the laws of the community under which we live.”

PHIL.

* Rom. vii. 9. † Ibid v. 6.

PHIL. Very probably so ; but, Who can help it ? Some persons are very apt, particularly in the sickening heat of controversy, to wink a little against the light. And it is not perhaps an improbable supposition, that this may actually be the case, with those who urge the objection you have mentioned. Indeed, without supposing something of that nature, one would imagine that so weak and ill-directed an objection would never have been raised ; for weak and ill-directed it most certainly is, as will evidently appear from the following queries.

Is not our obligation to the law of God entirely founded upon the relation which subsists between us and him, as CREATURES to the CREATOR ? Is not this relation unchangeable ? Must not the obligation, therefore, which is founded upon it be absolutely unalienable ?

NEO. The questions, I think, are plain and obvious ; and the affirmative sense of them undeniable. But perhaps some think, as the above objection seems to imply, that the obedience of Christ in our stead dissolves the preceding obligation ; or at least makes a considerable abatement in it.

PHIL. But such a thought, by whomsoever entertained, is, in my opinion, highly absurd. ' For the subsequent relation of a sinner to God, as forgiven and reconciled through Christ, can never take away, nay, can never alter his na-

tural.

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 237

tural relation as a creature, nor the obligation founded upon it. Notwithstanding, therefore, the former should take place, yet the latter remains unalienable.

Nor can the least abatement in the Divine law be possibly made, in a consistency with the perfections of the Great Lawgiver. No; his law is, and must be, like himself, without *variableness* or *shadow of turning*. It is an eternal rule of righteousness to all intelligent creatures. These things are evident, since the very design of God, in sending his Son into the world, was, That sinners might be saved, and yet the law be *MAGNIFIED and made HONOURABLE**. That its excellency, dignity, and glory might appear in the admirable obedience of our dear Emmanuel; and provision be made for a conformity to it, in the heart and life of every believer.

What the law could not do, says an inspired writer, *in that it was weak through the flesh*, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit†. From which words it is evident, that by the appearance of the Son of God in our world, sin hath received its final sentence; its dreadful sting is drawn; the law set in the most honourable point of view; and suitable provision made for the fulfilling of it by believers in their own

* If. xlii. 21.

† Rom. viii. 3, 4.

own persons. For, being *washed in the blood of Jesus*, and having their nature changed by a divine influence ; the *law* of God engraven upon their hearts, and a *new spirit* imparted to them ; they will certainly *have their fruit unto holiness*, and *walk even as Christ* their Exemplar walked.

NEO. The imparting of a *new spirit* to believers is, I think, a strong argument in favour of what you are considering.

PHIL. Undoubtedly it is ; for, God has either promised to the believer in Christ, that he will put his laws into his mind, &c. * or he has not. If he has not, How came the promise into the Bible ? And why does it continue there ? If he has, then suppose a man really to believe in Christ for salvation, and expect of him the fulfillment of this promise, and yet not only remain unholy, but even become a worse man than before, such a Phenomenon, if it could happen, would openly impeach the veracity of God.—The salutary influence then of Christ's satisfaction, truly relied on, is as certain as that God is no liar ;——it needs no greater,——it can have no greater security.

Upon the whole : I will venture to affirm, that the gospel system, of all others, is the best calculated to preserve our obligation to the law of God inviolable ; and that the persons who
are

* Ezek. xxxvi. 26—30. And Jer. xxxi. 32, &c.

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 239

are entirely *dead* to it in point of justification, make the most effectual provision for its honour, both in theory and practice.

NEO. The observation you have made, exactly agrees with my experience. For, I well remember the time, when I viewed the law as a rigorous master, and thought the Divine Being extremely severe, in his requirement of perfect obedience. But, I now see it in a vastly different point of light. I see that it is *holy, just, and good*; and I trust can say, with sincerity of heart, that I *have respect* to every command.

PHIL. The important work of conversion is effected solely by the agency of the Spirit of God. And it is generally begun by a true and heart-felt conviction, of the heinous nature, and destructive consequences of sin. A person, when under the influences of this Divine Agent, is given to see clearly that sin in itself is extremely odious,—that it is diametrically opposite to the nature of God,—and that it certainly exposes all who are the servants of it, to his righteous and eternal displeasure.

If then all who truly embrace the doctrine of satisfaction, and make the Lord Jesus Christ the one foundation of their hope, have had so alarming and affecting a view, of the evil of sin in itself, as well as of the destructive consequences that attend it;—if they have seen it as

that

that abominable thing which God's soul abhorreth, and the procuring cause of the Redeemer's death ;—Will such persons afterwards live in the voluntary commission of it? Will they cherish it in their bosoms, indulge it with their smiles, or manifest by their conduct that it is the object of their delight?

NEO. I believe not.

PHIL. No ; its hideous form, notwithstanding the specious garb it appears in, is clearly discerned by every convert ; and the *hatred wherewith he hates* it, like that of Amnon's to Tamar, is *greater, far greater than the love wherewith he had loved* it. In short, he *lothes* it, and himself on the account of it ; and, though God is now *pacified towards him after all that he has done*, yet he is *ashamed and confounded* that ever he should have been so palpably intoxicated with its soul-destroying, deceitful charms.

NEO. A modern author says, “ though much has been said about seeing *the evil of sin* in the death of Christ,—I must own I could never yet see *that evil* in the light of his being a victim to the justice of God.” And “ the annexing this idea to the death of Christ has an unfriendly aspect on religion and morals.—It is a *luscious* doctrine, which—permits men to gratify their sensual passions, at the same time that it flatters their heavenly hopes.”

PHIL.

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 241

PHIL. Supposing that the person you refer to "can see nothing of the evil of sin in the vicarious sufferings of Christ; what then? Does it follow that no such evil is discoverable there? Must all our intellects be measured by his? There are many who see no *form or comeliness* in Jesus, but consider him as "a man in all respects like themselves;" and yet *he is altogether lovely, the true God and eternal life*. And all who believe in him see him to be so.

The death of Christ, being of an expiatory nature, certainly discovers, in the clearest point of view, the great, the infinite demerit of sin; and one would imagine that any person, though his intellects should be very dim, might see, that if the blood of our great High Priest, who is truly and properly God, was necessary for the removal of iniquity, it gives an infinitely brighter display of its intrinsic evil, than though that removal could be effected by the tears of the creature's repentance. In the one case we see nothing more than the abasement of a man, in the other, the humiliation of a GOD.

As to what you have observed relative to its being "a luscious doctrine, &c." I must beg leave to confront it with the reasoning of one, who, in his day, was a leading person among the "devotees" of satisfaction, to whom they pay an implicit regard, and who has discussed the subject in a masterly, spirited manner.

NEO. I suppose you mean *such a one as Paul the aged*.

PHIL. The very person. And we think ourselves singularly happy, that so able an advocate is retained in our cause.—*The law, says our patron, entered, that the offence might abound: But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord**

Having thus stated his doctrine with great ability, clearness, and precision, like a wise and skilful disputant, he obviates a popular objection against it. *What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound†?—Will this doctrine “ gratify our passions at the same time that it flatters our heavenly hopes ?”*

NEO. So then the charging of the doctrine of free salvation by Christ, with weakening our obligations to holiness, is, it seems, no new thing; but hath been the uniform practice of its opposers, even from the first publication thereof.

PHIL. ‘ From the introduction of this objection by the apostle, we may either infer, that there were, even in these early days, some who branded the doctrine of redemption by the free grace of God with this odious consequence; or that he, by the inspiration of the Almighty

* Rom. v. 20, 21. † Rom. vi. 1.

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 243

Almighty, did foresee that there should arise, in some future periods of the Christian church, adversaries who would attempt to load it with this imputation; or that the doctrine is indeed liable, on a superficial view, to be abused to this unhappy purpose, by the deceitful hearts of men, who are wedded to their lusts.'

However, this noble champion for the cause of truth, answers to them all, by rejecting the consequence with the utmost abhorrence. God forbid! We detest the thought; and absolutely deny that it hath the least foundation either in principle or practice. Indeed the thing is in itself impossible; for *how shall we that are DEAD to sin LIVE ANY longer therein?* Can a man deprived of vital heat, perform the functions of animal life? No more can a man who is dead to sin, be found engaged in the service of it. The very supposition of such a thing, in either case, is highly absurd and inconsistent.

There may indeed be persons found who *profess* to believe this doctrine, whose lives are not correspondent with it. But these, I am persuaded, are comparatively few. And there are none who believe it *with all their heart*, but are so far delivered from the power of sin, that, in the language of scripture, they *have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts*.

Permit me to observe further, concerning the reasoning of the apostle, that it is a striking proof that the doctrine of satisfaction, accord-

ing to our view of it, is the very doctrine which he taught. For, if the system of our opponents, concerning the justification of a sinner, by his repentance and constant obedience, were the system of Paul, such an objection would be quite unnatural and absurd. Whereas, according to our plan, it seems to arise spontaneously from the carnal mind.—Nor, indeed, is this to be wondered at. For, while persons are unrenewed in *the spirit of their minds**; while they are destitute of a clear conviction of the evil of sin in itself, as highly dishonourable to the Divine Being, they have a strong propensity to transgress the law, whenever they think it may be done with impunity. And, as they have no quarrel with sin as sin, or for what it is in itself, but only on account of its destructive consequences; so, were they but delivered from the apprehension of these, they would, to use the language of inspiration, *draw iniquity with cords of vanity, and sin as it were with a cart-rope*†.

The truth is, the reigning power of sin, in the hearts of such persons, is not broken; and therefore they form a judgement of others from their own feelings, and this is the ground of their palpable mistake. So that though the objection stands plainly refuted in the word of God, and likewise by the life of every one who hath cordially *received the atonement*, yet it will,
I be-

* Eph. iv. 23, † 11. v. 18.

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 245

I believe, be warmly and constantly urged, by the opposers of the truth, till time shall be no longer.

NEO. The reasoning of the apostle is indeed extremely pertinent upon the present occasion; and, I think, affords a striking proof of the agreement of the doctrine which you have espoused, with that which he is supporting. And your foregoing observation, concerning that discovery of sin, in its own nature, which every one must necessarily have, previous to his embracing the propitiation of Christ, is, in my opinion, perfectly agreeable both to scripture and experience. For, *the whole have no need of a physician, but they who are sick**.

PHIL. True. And I add further, that, as every one who hath fled to Christ for refuge hath, previous to his flight, been truly humbled under a sense of sin; so when he is safely lodged in that soul-securing covert, from the threatening storm of the Divine wrath, his views of its heinousness are considerably extended, and his sorrow on the account of it by far more ingenuous. This will, I think, appear obvious, if we consider what has already been observed, namely, That the sufferings of Christ are the brightest mirror in which the evil and malignity of sin is displayed. Now, these are the theme on which the believer frequently meditates, and

X 3

on.

* Matt. ix. 12.

on which he dwells with unspeakable delight. And I will appeal to you, Neophytus, and to every one who is a partaker of *like precious faith**, whether, when grace is in exercise, you can view the sufferings of the Lamb of God, without feeling a mortal hatred against that accursed thing, which was the only procuring cause of them?

No; I will venture to answer for you; that while you view the *sword* of justice, *smiting the man who was God's fellow*†; while by faith you look to HIM, *whom by your sins you have pierced*‡; you mourn as one mourneth for his only son, and are in bitterness for him, as one is in bitterness for his first-born§. In these moments you can, I doubt not, say with the apostle, *God forbid that I should glory, save in the CROSS of the Lord Jesus Christ; by whom the world is CRUCIFIED unto me, and I unto the world*||.

The truth is, nothing can possibly give us so striking a representation of the odiousness of sin, as to see the blessed Jesus expanded on the cross. This effectually destroys its power; this gives it its death's wound. And therefore I must again repeat the question, *How shall they who are DEAD to sin, LIVE any longer therein?* Persons may declaim upon the "amiableness of virtue," and "the moral fitness of things," but, alas! without true faith in a crucified Saviour,

* 2 Pet. i. 1. † Zech. xiii. 7. ‡ Ibid xii. 10.

§ Zech. xii. 10. || Gal. vi. 14.

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 247

Saviour, the heart will remain under the power of sin.

Thus doth the great apostle and patron of our doctrine, discuss the subject in his letter to the church at Rome. Perhaps some of his opponents might be silenced thereby ; while others no doubt would persist in their malicious attempts to destroy it. There are other things he opposes in that epistle, but this makes the most distinguishing figure ; this he attends to with the greatest assiduity. Indeed, no man regards an eruption upon the surface, when the noble parts are invaded, and he feels a mortification approaching to his heart.

NEO. So far as I know myself, I must say, that never doth sin appear to me in so odious a point of light ; never do I find so intense a hatred rise in my breast against it, as when I view it in the glass of the sufferings of Christ. Here I behold it as *exceeding sinful indeed* * ! And from this discovery I am powerfully induced, *to abstain from the very appearance of evil.*

PHIL. Ay, and so will all who are acquainted with the grace of God in truth. And what will further excite to such a practice, is, That the satisfaction of Christ, according to our representation of it, exhibits the clearest ideas of the Divine perfections. In this method of salvation, and in this only, there is *glory to God*
IN

* Rom. vii. 13.

IN THE HIGHEST; while, at the same time, *peace* is proclaimed *on earth, and good-will towards men**.

NEO. I wish you would illustrate that a little.

PHIL. Here then the *love* of God, that distinguishing perfection of his nature, is displayed in the most conspicuous manner. For, says an inspired writer, *HEREIN is love*, this is as it were the central point of it, namely—*That God sent his Son to be the PROPITIATION FOR OUR SINS*†.

In this plan of redemption through the blood of Jesus, the Father of lights *bath* likewise *abounded towards us in all WISDOM and PRUDENCE*‡. In other things the wisdom of God is manifest, but here, if I may use the expression, it overflows its banks. And hence the Redeemer himself, on account of his engaging in that important work, is emphatically styled, *The WISDOM of GOD*§.

Mercy also, in this scheme, unfolds her dazzling beauties, and displays her charms to a spiritual eye. That *the Day-spring from on high* should ever *have visited* our world is *entirely owing to the TENDER MERCY of our God*§.

Justice too, upon this plan, is exhibited in the most striking colours. By *bruising his own Son*,

* Luke ii. 14. † 1 John iv. 10. ‡ Eph. i. 7.

§ 1 Cor. i. 24. § Luke i. 78.

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 249

Son, and making *his soul an offering for sin*, the Supreme Governor of the universe, hath given the strongest proof of the holiness of his law, and the righteousness of his government, to all who are acquainted with the amazing scene. In a word, 'in the account given in the scripture of the redemption of the world by the substitution of a Saviour, the almighty power, the unsearchable wisdom, the boundless goodness, the inflexible justice, and the inviolable truth of God, shine with united splendor.'

NEO. Yes, blessed be God, he has given me, in some measure at least, *the light of the knowledge of his glory, in the face of Jesus Christ*.

PHIL. Well, we may consider it as a first principle, That 'as is the God so are his worshippers.' If therefore the glory of the Divine Character be most perspicuously displayed in the method of salvation by the atonement of Christ, surely those who receive that atonement, will endeavour to form themselves after so glorious a pattern.

Upon the whole: Since the satisfaction of Christ presents us with so striking a view of the Divine purity and justice, that any person who cordially embraces that doctrine should *continue in sin*, is quite improbable. Will not such an a one rather say, from a consciousness of his own unworthiness, *Who can stand before this holy Lord God* *! And will he not, from such a consideration,

* 1 Sam. vi. 20.

ration, be excited to *purify himself even as God is pure* * ?

NEO. If I reply to your questions from the exercises of my own mind, I can readily answer in the affirmative. For the more I consider the Divine perfections, as they are displayed in the Person and Satisfaction of Christ, the more am I induced to imitate them, and to *follow holiness without which, I am absolutely certain, no man shall see the Lord.*

PHIL. What you have now expressed is undoubtedly the experience of every true believer in Christ. For like causes will ever be productive of like effects. And as that Glorious Being, *who once commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into their hearts, to give them the light of the knowledge of his glory in the face of Jesus Christ* † ; so, in consequence of these views, which are always transforming, they *are changed into the same image, from glory to glory* §.

You will permit me to add one thing more upon this subject and then I have done.

NEO. Surely. For to dwell upon this delightful theme, is no less pleasing to me than it is profitable and instructive.

PHIL. The Satisfaction of Christ then, according to our view of it, is particularly calculated to excite in us a supreme love to God,
and

* 2 Cor. iv. 6. § Ib. iii. 18.

and to impress the mind with a sense of the warmest gratitude to so munificent a Benefactor. Now love is unquestionably the most powerful mean of begetting love. As therefore we have, in the death of Christ, the brightest display of the perfections of God in general, and of his stupendous *love* in particular; and as the most invaluable blessings are conferred upon us in consequence of that amazing transaction, so it must necessarily excite every proper expression of love, wherever it is cordially believed.

From this representation of the case, we see the propriety of the apostle's assertion, *We love him because he first loved us* *. Indeed the glories of the Godhead are so illustriously displayed, and the love of the Divine Three so conspicuously exhibited, in the amazing work of redemption by the sacrifice of Christ, that for any person, whose spiritual *senses are exercised*, to contemplate that most glorious object, and yet remain devoid of affection to God, is absolutely impossible. Nay, not only will he have some degree of affection for God and divine things, but they will be the *chief* objects in his esteem. *Whom have I in heaven but thee?* is the language of every believer.

Now sincere and fervent love, all must allow, is the most powerful motive to obedience. It will reconcile the mind to the most difficult requirements.

* 1 John iv. 19.

requirements. When under the influence of this principle, the believer is, as it were, *bound* to his duty; his efforts to please are almost incredible; he even courts the opportunity of doing something, to manifest his affection for his once bleeding, but now exalted Lord. The language of such persons is, *The love of Christ CONSTRAINETH us*, or, according to the import of the original word, '*it beareth us away, like a strong and rapid torrent; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they who live, should not live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them, and rose again* *.

Such, Neophytus, were the sentiments of the primitive Christians, and such will be the language of all who deserve that honourable appellation to the end of time. The consideration that *when we were enemies Christ died for us* §, is the most animating spring to obedience, and the most powerful incentive to the discharge of duty. It overcomes all difficulties, and makes even suffering a source of delight.

NEO. I have too great reason to lament the coldness of my affection towards God and divine things, and my little zeal and activity in his service. But, however, I trust it is sincere, and in some measure operative both in my heart and life. And I can with truth affirm, That a
discovery

* 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

§ Rom. v. 9—12.

X.
of
und
in-
lo-
his
he
rist
m-
ay,
bus
d:
uld
for

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 253

discovery of the love of God, in the salvation of guilty sinners, especially when considered as terminating upon myself, is the most prevalent motive to duty, and has the most powerful effect upon my mind.

From a consciousness of this, I make the words of the apostle the matter of my frequent prayer, *That I may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge**.

PHIL. The apostle knew perfectly well the strength and influence of this principle, and therefore he expresseth it in the strongest terms. *Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?—Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors, through him that hath loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord†.*

If then a believing view of the satisfaction of Christ, necessarily and constantly produce a supreme love to the Divine Being, such a view is most certainly the grand principle of our sanctification. And this, the above-mentioned writer had in view, when he says, *God forbid that I*
VOL. II. Y should

* Eph. iii. 18, 19.

† Rom. viii. 35, to the end.

should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, BY WHOM THE WORLD IS CRUCIFIED TO ME, AND I UNTO THE WORLD.*

NEO. You seem to think then, that in proportion as our hearts are *directed into the love of God*, so our sanctification is increased.

PHIL. I do: for, What is the great source, evidence, sum, and perfection of sanctification? Is it not the love of God? And how shall this love be produced, how shall it be preserved and improved in so effectual a manner, as by believing views of the atonement of Christ, the most tender and costly expression of his love to us? How does this fill the Christian with indignation against sin! How does it endear to him the commands of his Saviour! In short, by the powerful influence of this principle, he will be induced continually to *exercise himself, to keep a conscience void of offence, both towards God and men* §.

And permit me to add, Neophytus, that such persons are under the strongest obligations from *gratitude*, to do the will of God, by every proper expression of obedience to it. Now, gratitude is, perhaps, of all others, the most powerful principle of action. It is in most cases, considerably stronger than the opposite motives of force or fear. It must, therefore, operate powerfully upon the heart of every believer.

The

* Gal. vi. 14.

§ Acts xxiv. 16.

The true christian, when he views by faith the invaluable favours which the Father of mercies hath conferred upon him, and likewise considers those more important ones which he hath still in reserve, will surely be induced to say, from the most penetrating sense of the Divine favour, *What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits towards me* * ? And to take the cup of salvation †; to express the sense which he has of the divine favours, and to devote himself entirely and perpetually to the service of God, will undoubtedly be his fixed and determinate resolution.

I hope that you, Neophytus, are not an entire stranger to the power and efficacy of this principle.

NEO. I hope not. For, when in the light of the word of God, by the influences of the Holy Spirit, I am enabled in some measure to view my relation to Christ, and consider all those *spiritual blessings* with which *we are blessed in him*, I frequently adopt the language you have mentioned, and am desirous to do something for HIM who hath done such great and glorious things for me.

PHIL. A sense of invaluable favours received, and a consciousness of utter unworthiness to receive the least of them, will certainly be productive of thankfulness and gratitude. And

Y 2

those

* Psal. cxvi. 12. † Verse 13.

those views and this grateful disposition will, I apprehend, bear an exact proportion to each other. If the former be extensive the latter must necessarily rise high. Whereas if those are contracted this will be proportionally small.

For example : When *Jesus once sat at meat in Simon the Pharisee's house*, we are told, that a woman in the city, who was a notorious sinner, when she knew that *Jesus* was there, brought an alabaster-box of ointment, and stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment. This procedure gave offence to Simon. He was amazed that his noble Guest should in the least countenance so flagrant a sinner. *Jesus*, therefore, in order to show the reason of this, spoke the following parable.

There was a certain creditor, who had two debtors ; the one owed him five hundred pence, and the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me, therefore, which of them will love him most ? The answer was obvious. And he gave it accordingly. I suppose that he to whom he forgave much. And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged. For, to whom little is forgiven the same loveth little, but to whom much is forgiven, the same loveth much.*

If then a clear view of the extent of the divine law, and of our unalienable obligation to it ;

* Luke vii. 36, to the end.

it; if a discovery of the heinous nature of sin, and of the infinite purity and holiness of God; if, in short, the warmest love and gratitude can be effective of gospel holiness; it must be found in those who embrace the satisfaction of Christ.

NEO. My mind is now perfectly easy with respect to the doctrine we have been conversing upon; and I shall, I hope, be enabled to hold it fast against all opposition. I see, and I trust feel too, that it has a direct tendency to promote the interest of practical, vital godliness, and to make men holy, heavenly, and spiritual.

PHIL. Yes; the *grace of God*, the amazing *riches* of his grace, discovered in the gospel, *teacheth us*, to whom it hath appeared, *to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly, in the present world**. This, I might illustrate by a great variety of scripture examples. I might with great propriety introduce the almost innumerable instances we have in the New Testament, of the remarkable change that appeared in persons, when they truly believed in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The inestimable blessings of the gospel, are so far from weakening the motives to obedience, or relaxing its vital springs, that, on the contrary, they greatly strengthen the one, and considerably accelerate the other. *We ourselves,*

Y 3

say!

* Titus ii. 11, 12.

say the recipients of the glorious gospel, *were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another.* This, however odious and sinful, was our real character. We followed the pleasure-taking world with the greatest alacrity, and, contrary to law, gospel, conscience, and interest, joined the sin-deceived multitude with abundance of pleasure.

But, they add, after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, our course of life was entirely altered. Actuated by the noblest motives, and aiming at the most important end, we now live soberly, righteously, and godly, in the present evil world. Like trees planted in a generous soil, and watered by the flow of some adjacent river, we are enabled to produce the fruits of righteousness—to the praise and glory of God.

The most eminent saints then you see, whose character is delineated in the New Testament, frankly acknowledged, that what induced them to live to God in holy obedience, was—not “principles of nature’s planting,” but the *mercy and grace of God* manifested in the way of salvation by Christ.

NEO. That seems undeniably evident.

PHIL. Well, and if you read over the epistolary part of the New Testament, with this view, you will find that the sacred writers, like
wife

wise master-builders, first laid a proper foundation by opening the capital truths of the gospel, and then raised the superstructure of Christian obedience. Conscious that they were directed by an infallible guide, they unanimously endeavoured to unfold the riches of Divine grace, in order to warm the hearts of their readers; and then, steady to the interest of *pure and undefiled religion*, they pathetically exhort them to Christian duty.

NEO. It is urged however, that the "general character of the votaries of Calvinism, is known to be that of bigotry to their own modes and sentiments, without any grains of charitable allowance for those that differ from them." And, in short, the author I refer to says, "he has not discovered in any other denomination that he is acquainted with, a disposition so dogmatically intolerant, and favouring so little of the mild and benevolent one of the gospel." That *Rational churchmen*, and *Rational dissenters*, are seldom or ever spoke of but in terms of reproach:—And that "if their power were but as little circumscribed, as their tongues and pens, it is to be feared they would pursue the same sanguinary measures with regard to both, which their founder and apostle JOHN CALVIN was not ashamed to glory in."

PHIL. An envenomed charge indeed! Like a poisoned arrow, it is designed to prove mortal;

tal; but *the breast-plate of righteousness*, which those persons against whom it is so forcibly thrown, *have on*, effectually secures them from the intended destruction. Let us however take a little more particular notice of it.

The general character of Calvinists*, I think you said, “is known to be that of *bigotry* to their own modes and sentiments,” and that they discover little “of the mild and benevolent disposition of the gospel.”—Pray what is meant by bigotry?

NEO. In the connexion it stands in, in the passage I have quoted, I should imagine it means, an unreasonable, blind attachment to some particular set of principles.

PHIL.

* I am unavoidably led by the author whom I answer here, to use the term Calvinist. However, the candid, serious reader will see, that the persons whose moral conduct is defended, are not persons of any particular set of principles, or particular denomination, but in general all who live by faith in Christ as their righteousness and strength. Though I do believe those commonly called Calvinists explain the doctrine of faith in Christ in the most scriptural manner, yet I entirely agree with that excellent writer WITHERSPOON, to whose Essay on Justification I have been indebted for some thoughts, and who says page 75 in the note of that work speaking of Arminians. I am persuaded there have been and are many good men among them; which may be accounted for in this manner, that their hearts are better than their understandings: and they are habitually under the government of principles, which through some mistaken views and groundless fears of their abuse, they speak of more sparingly, or rather seem to establish the contrary positions.

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 261

PHIL. A set of principles the Calvinists undoubtedly have, which they, in conformity to the apostle, call *the principles of the doctrine of Christ*. These they are indeed steadily, but neither unreasonably nor blindly attached to, and think it their indispensable duty, *earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints*. Sensible of the happy influence of these principles upon the mind, and conscious of their originating from above, they cannot be induced to part with them either by the frowns or flattery of men.

But then, Is this bigotry? Is it really that contemptible, pride-born thing which some would represent it to be?—Our Saviour himself however, during the whole scene of his abode on earth, and particularly towards the close of his life, discovered himself the subject of it in a considerable degree. He *witnessed a good confession before Pontius Pilate*, and, notwithstanding his uncommon trials, never relinquished, nor indeed abated, his steady and disinterested adherence to the truth.

The apostles imitated their master in this. *They held fast the faithful word*. Nor smiles nor threats could shake their adherence to *the glorious gospel of the blessed God*. They uniformly and steadily maintained, in their preaching, writing, and conversation, that *whom God did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son*;—that *whom he did predestinate*

predestinate them he also called : and whom he called, them he also justified : and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

Now, this is the very soul of what is commonly called "Calvinism," and therefore all who *continue stedfast in the apostles doctrine*, must in the opinion of your author, be obstinate bigots. How unjust the charge !

NEO. But it is said you know, that those persons are "dogmatically intolerant," and favour very little of the mild and benevolent spirit of the gospel.

PHIL. I should like to be told precisely what your author means by "the mild and benevolent disposition of the gospel." And the rather, because I apprehend that in this, as well as in most other things that relate to religion, our ideas are far from being the same.—Charity, or benevolence, as the term is used by many, seems to consist in hoping well of every one respecting his eternal welfare, though he should *deny the Lord that bought him*, or tread under *foot the Son of God*—using every precaution not to disturb the sinful repose of your neighbour, or in the least to alarm his sin-secure conscience—permitting every one "to go quietly through the world in the exercise of his reasonable faculties," though he never so much as *seek to enter in at the strait gate*—and being kind to your fellow-creatures with respect to their

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 263

their *bodies*, though their souls be unpitied in misery and ruin.

But is *this* the charity, or benevolence of the scripture? Is *this* that important soul-adorning grace, which is greater than either *faith*, or *hope*? Can it be thought that our Lord and his ambassadors, when speaking of the God-like virtue charity, should mean no more than *this* by it?

NEO. How do *you* apprehend a gospel spirit is manifested, or How does the benevolence you were speaking of discover itself?

PHIL. Not by the opinion we form of persons, concerning the safety or danger of their state; for that is only an act of the understanding, independent of the will, and is, or ought to be, always in exact proportion to evidence. Indeed, we must first form a judgement of persons; we must first consider men as being Christians, before we can love them with Christian affection.

The forming of this opinion therefore, is not charity; it is something antecedent to it: Charity is of a nobler nature, and consists in the exercises of the heart. And if you would be informed of the particular branches of it, read over at your leisure the thirteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, where it is most beautifully and faithfully delineated.— In general, it is manifested in wishing well to
their

the souls of men, and, so far as lies in our power, promoting their best, their eternal interests, though not to the exclusion of their temporal ones.

If this then be Christian charity, that is, the charity of the bible, Who do you think has most of it? Who prays most ardently for the conversion of sinners, or the prosperity of those that believe? Who talks most freely with their fellow-creatures concerning the state of their souls, and their views of the eternal world? And I may add, Who more ready to contribute to the wants of the necessitous, especially when they hope it may be in some measure subservient to promote their spiritual and eternal welfare?

NEO. But “they seldom or ever speak of *Rational churchmen*, and *Rational dissenters*, but in terms of reproach.”

PHIL. To speak “in terms of reproach” of any person is certainly wrong, unless the character be such as deserves it.—But “*Rational churchmen*” who deliberately subscribe what they absolutely disbelieve, and solemnly worship in the face of the congregation, a person whom they consider as a mere creature;—or “*Rational dissenters*” who disbelieve, and *privately* speak against the Deity of Christ, who consider him as being “a man in all respects like themselves,” and yet speak *publicly* in such a manner as that those who have heard them for a succession of years do not know this; *these*, they

how moral soever in their conduct, or insinuating in their address, are certainly proper objects of reproach and contempt.

“That *such* there are, is a point about which you and I can have no dispute.” But wherever they are found, the character is detestable; the procedure odious. No wonder then that these, by persons who see something of the value and importance of truth, should be held in contempt, and sometimes spoken of in reproachful terms. They certainly deserve it, and the interest of Christianity seems to require it. So far then the charge is admitted.

With respect to others who are open and ingenuous, and who apparently act the honest, conscientious part, far from speaking of them reproachfully, the Calvinists as a body *pity* and *pray* for them, as well-meaning though mistaken men: As persons who, like Saul, verily think *they are doing* God service, even when they are acting in a manner entirely subversive of his glory and his people's good.

NEO. What do you think then of the assertion, that “if the power of the Calvinists were but as little circumscribed as their tongues and pens, it is to be feared they would pursue the same sanguinary measures with regard to both,” i. e. both Rational churchmen, and Rational dissenters, “which their founder and apostle JOHN CALVIN was not ashamed to glory in.”

PHIL. I think "it is false in fact," and therefore to be entirely disregarded. John Calvin the founder of the sect! He their apostle and head! No; such sly insinuations apart. Though the people called Calvinists highly esteem that learned, exemplary, indefatigable, zealous Reformer, they never consider him either as their "founder," or "apostle." They think it their duty to follow him so far as he followed Christ, and that he followed him in many things, both with respect to doctrine and discipline, the most malicious and calumniating pen must allow; but where he deviated from so perfect a pattern, in that we think it our duty to deviate from him.

As to the sanguinary measures he pursued in the case of Servetus, no one that I know of, so much as attempts to justify them; they will be an indelible reproach upon his character: But then it should be considered, he had only just emerged from the bloody sea of popery, and therefore no wonder that he should retain something of that unchristian, tyrannical disposition, which so strongly marks that *scarlet-coloured whore*. However, it may not be amiss to observe, in justice to that great, and eminent Reformer, that his character must have been in other respects irreproachable*; otherwise we cannot

* JOHN CALVIN was a native of Noyon in France, and pastor and professor of divinity at Geneva, whose genius, learning, eloquence, and talents rendered him respectable even
in

cannot doubt, from the almost numberless malevolent specimens which have been given, that every flaw would have been exposed to public view, and a mole-hill if possible converted into a mountain.

As to what you have observed relative to the blood-thirsty disposition of those, who have embraced that system of truth commonly called Calvinism, it is not well-founded. That too much of a persecuting spirit, under the disguise of zeal for the truth, has been found amongst them, is readily granted. But what denomination can plead an exemption from this? Have not all successively been guilty of it? Why then should the Calvinists be holden up to view more than others? Though in some instances they may have carried it with too high a hand, yet it is certain they have been the persons who have chiefly suffered. It is hoped however, that this detestable principle, which is the child of pride and ignorance, is considerably weakened among Protestants of every denomination; and surely it is the prayer of every individual, that it may be reduced to a state of total annihilation.

A a 2

With

in the eyes of his enemies. Mosheim's eccles. hist. vol. iv. page 70.—And the translator says, Calvin was a man whose extensive genius, flowing eloquence, immense learning, extraordinary penetration, indefatigable industry, and fervent piety, placed him at the head of the Reformers. See vol 3, page 352.

With respect to the *founder* of our religion, we have *one Master, even CHRIST*. He is the *APOSTLE as well as High Priest of our profession*. And we think it our indispensable duty, implicitly to receive his doctrines, and steadily and uniformly to walk in the delightful, and profitable way of his commandments.

NEO. I cannot but return my grateful acknowledgements to you Philanthropos, for the *labour of love* you have manifested towards me. I hope the substance of our repeated conversations will be retained in mind, and be of considerable service to me during the remaining part of my pilgrimage state.

PHIL. I am glad of it : Let it be our daily prayer, that we may feel the power of divine truth upon our hearts, that we may be sanctified by it,—and abound in every good word and work. For, after all, our practice will be the best refutation of the unjust slanders cast upon us, and most effectually silence the calumnies of every opposer. This must manifest our *doctrine to be according to godliness*. This must, and will, in a good measure at least, *put to silence the ignorance of foolish men*. It will cause them to be *ashamed, who falsely accuse our good conversation in Christ*.

Having thus cleared the doctrine of satisfaction from the many ill-natured charges fixed upon it; having shewn that they have no just foundation

foundation either in theory or practice; we might, if such a procedure were thought eligible, easily and with sufficient propriety recriminate. It might be demonstrably shewn, both from scripture and plain matter of fact, that the tenets of our opposers have a pernicious tendency; and that, like some noxious planet, they diffuse their malignant influences wherever they come.

NEO. Do you think so?

PHIL. I am certain of it: For, permit me to ask, Whether do the friends or enemies of the doctrine of satisfaction, pay a more diligent attention to the bible? Whether are more careful to maintain the spirit of devotion, both in themselves and their dependents? Whether are more frequently seen at all public places of diversion, where vice is openly countenanced, and undismayedly erects her hydra-head? Whether more commonly frequent the playhouse, the gaming-table, the horse-course, the midnight revel, &c. &c. I say such questions as these might be asked, and we might safely appeal to the world, and let our enemies themselves answer them.

NEO. None can hesitate a moment with respect to the questions you have asked. Matter of fact speaks aloud. Those in general, who frequent the places you have mentioned, make not the least pretensions to Calvinism. Nay,

they frequently speak against it, as a morose, uncharitable, pleasure-destroying system.

PHIL. Well, there then the cause rests; and there I believe we may safely leave it.— You have now, according to your desire, heard in part at least, the scripture evidence both of the *necessity* and *reality* of the satisfaction of Christ. You have heard likewise the inestimable blessings procured by it, and its salutary tendency upon the mind.—It is probable you may think we might have reduced it into a far smaller compass: Had we had nothing to have done but to have produced the evidence, that might have been very easily effected. But from the shrewdness of some of the objections you have mentioned, the unreasonableness of others, and the indeterminate manner in which many of them are expressed; on these accounts the subject has been necessarily protracted, and kept considerably longer in hand.

NEO. I am far from being weary Philanthropos, and therefore apologies are unnecessary, and especially as it has been at my own request.

PHIL. I have then only to pray that what has been said agreeably to the will and word of God, may be so grafted into your heart as to produce the fruits of righteousness. That is the test of the truth, and utility of all doctrines; and, permit me to add, that is the evidence
which

Dial. XX. OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION. 271

which will try what spirit we are of, when the once crucified, but now exalted Jesus, shall appear to reward every man according to his works.——Then shall it be finally decided what principles will enable a man to abide the force of this trial; and my prayer for the authors whom I have particularly animadverted upon, is, That they may be so guided by the grace and spirit of God here, as to be then found on that side which will enable them to stand with boldness and safety before the judge of quick and dead!

THE END.



Lately published by the same Author,

Price ONE SHILLING and SIX-PENCE,

T H E
DIVINE CHARACTER
O F
C H R I S T

Considered and Vindicated.

I N

A SERIES of DIALOGUES.

In which the many scriptural evidences of the Deity of our Lord are fairly exhibited ;—— the various objections thrown out against it, particularly in some late publications, distinctly answered ;——and the whole interspersed with such reflections, as appeared to be naturally deducible from the subject.

r,

R

T

S.

the

it,

at-

fed

ta-